arXiv:0906.4586v1 [quant-ph] 25 Jun 2009

Hoare Logic for Quantum Programs*

Mingsheng Ying
University of Technology, Sydney and Tsinghua University†

June 25, 2009

Abstract

Hoare logic is a foundation of axiomatic semantics of classical programs and it provides effective proof techniques for reasoning about correctness of classical programs. To offer similar techniques for quantum program verification and to build a logical foundation of programming methodology for quantum computers, we develop a full-fledged Hoare logic for both partial and total correctness of quantum programs. It is proved that this logic is (relatively) complete by exploiting the power of weakest preconditions and weakest liberal preconditions for quantum programs.

Keywords: Quantum computation, programming language, axiomatic semantics, Hoare logic, completeness

1 Introduction

Even though quantum hardware is still in its infancy, people widely believe that building a large-scale and functional quantum computer is merely a matter of time and concentrated effort. The history of classical computing arouses that once quantum computers come into being, quantum programming languages and quantum software development techniques will play a key role in exploiting the power of quantum computers. With expectation of offering effective programming techniques for quantum computers, several quantum programming languages have already been designed in recent years. The earliest proposal for quantum programming language was made by Knill [13]. The first real quantum programming language, QCL, was

*This work was partly supported the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No: 60736011, 60621062) and the National Key Project for Fundamental Research of China (Grant No: 2007CB807901)

†Author's address: Mingsheng Ying, Center of Quantum Computation and Intelligent Systems, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology, University of Technology, Sydney, City Campus, 15 Broadway, Ultimo, NSW 2007, Australia, and State Key Laboratory of Intelligent Technology and Systems, Tsinghua National Laboratory for Information Science and Technology, Department of Computer Science and Technology, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China, email: myying@it.uts.edu.au or yingmsh@tsinghua.edu.cn

proposed by Ömer [16]; he also implemented a simulator for this language. A quantum programming language in the style of Dijkstra's guarded-command language, qGCL, was presented by Sanders and Zuliani [18]. A quantum extension of C++ was proposed by Bettelli et al [6], and it was implemented in the form of a C++ library. The first and very influential quantum language of the functional programming paradigm, QFC, was defined by Selinger [19] based on the idea of classical control and quantum data. In [2], Altenkirch and Grattage defined another functional programming language for quantum computing, QML, in which both control and data may be quantum. For excellent survey of quantum programming languages, see [20, 12].

The fact that human intuition is much better adapted to the classical world than the quantum world is one of the major reasons that it is difficult to find efficient quantum algorithms. It also implies that programmers will commit much more faults in designing programs for quantum computers than programming classical computers. Thus, it is even more critical than in classical computing to give clear and formal semantics to quantum programming languages and to provide formal methods for reasoning about quantum programs. Indeed, various semantic approaches to quantum programs have been proposed in recent literatures. For example, an operational semantics was given to Sanders and Zuliani's language qGCL [18] by treating an observation (quantum measurement) procedure as a probabilistic choice; a denotational semantics was defined for Selinger's language QPL [19] by interpreting quantum programs as super-operators; and a denotational semantics of Altenkirch and Grattage's language QML [2] was described in category-theoretic terms. In addition, a language-independent approach to semantics of quantum programs was proposed by D'Hondt and Panangaden [10] who introduced an intrinsic notion of quantum weakest precondition and established a beautiful Stone-type duality between state transition semantics and predicate transformer semantics for quantum programs.

As to proof systems for reasoning about quantum programs, Baltag and Smets [4, 5, 1] presented a dynamic logic formalism of information flows in quantum systems, which is capable of describing various quantum operations such as unitary evolutions and quantum measurements, and particularly entanglements in multi-partite quantum systems. Brunet and Jorrand [8] introduced a way of applying Birkhoff and von Neumann's quantum logic [7] to the study of quantum programs by expanding the usual propositional languages with new primitives representing unitary transformations and quantum measurements. In [9], Chadha, Mateus and Sernadas proposed a Hoare-style proof system for reasoning about imperative quantum programs using a quantitative state logic, but only bounded iterations are allowed in their programming language. Feng et al [11] found some useful proof rules for reasoning about quantum loops, generalizing some of Morgan's proof rules for probabilistic loops [14]. To the author's best knowledge, however, no complete Hoare logic for quantum programs has been reported in the literature.

The main contribution of the present paper is the establishment of a full-fledged

Hoare logic for deterministic quantum programs based on Selinger's idea of modeling quantum programs as super-operators and D'Hondt and Panangaden's notion of quantum predicate as an Hermitian operator [10]. This logic includes a proof system for partial correctness and a proof system for total correctness of deterministic quantum programs. In particular, we are able to prove its (relative) completeness by exploiting the power of weakest preconditions and weakest liberal preconditions for quantum programs.

The paper is organized as follows: For convenience of the reader, we recall some basic concepts of Hilbert spaces as well as the fundamental postulates of quantum mechanics in Section 2. Another aim of Section 2 is to fix notation used in the sequel sections. In Section 3, we define the syntax of deterministic quantum programs about which the Hoare logic presented in this paper is designed to reason. Such quantum programs are quantum extension of classical **while**-programs (cf. [3], Chapter 3). In Section 4, an operational semantics of quantum programs is given in terms of transitions between quantum configurations, which consist of a quantum program still to be executed and a (partial) density operator expressing the current state of program variables. In Section 5, we are able to introduce a denotational semantics of quantum programs based on the operational semantics. A denotational semantics of a quantum program is defined to be a function from partial density operators to themselves. In Section 6, we adopt D'Hondt and Panangaden's definition of quantum predicates as Hermitian operators. Then a correctness formula is defined to be a quantum extension of Hoare triple, which consists of two quantum predicates, namely precondition and postcondition, as well as a quantum program. Furthermore, the notions of partial and total correctness can be introduced for quantum programs using their denotational semantics. In Section 7, weakest precondition and weakest liberal precondition for quantum programs are defined in terms of total and partial correctness, respectively, in a familiar way. With the long preparation of the previous sections, the Hoare logic for quantum programs is finally established in Sections 8 and 9. In Section 8, a proof system for partial correctness of quantum programs is presented, and its (relative) completeness is proved, and in Section 9, after introducing the notion of bound function for quantum loops, a proof system for total correctness of quantum programs is given, and its (relative) completeness is also proved. A brief conclusion is drawn and some open problems for further studies are pointed out in Section 10.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Hilbert Spaces

We write $\mathbb{C}$ for the set of complex numbers. For each complex number $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, λ^* stands for the conjugate of λ. A (complex) vector space is a nonempty set $\mathcal{H}$ together with two operations: vector addition $+ : \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ and scalar multiplication $\cdot : \mathbb{C} \times \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$, satisfying the following conditions:

1. $(\mathcal{H}, +)$ is an abelian group, its zero element 0 is called the zero vector;
2. $1|\varphi\rangle = |\varphi\rangle$;
3. $\lambda(\mu|\varphi\rangle) = \lambda\mu|\varphi\rangle$;
4. $(\lambda + \mu)|\varphi\rangle = \lambda|\varphi\rangle + \mu|\varphi\rangle$; and
5. $\lambda(|\varphi\rangle + |\psi\rangle) = \lambda|\varphi\rangle + \lambda|\psi\rangle$

for any $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{C}$ and $|\varphi\rangle, |\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$.

An inner product over a vector space $\mathcal{H}$ is a mapping $\langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle : \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{C}$ satisfying the following properties:

1. $\langle\varphi|\varphi\rangle \geq 0$ with equality if and only if $|\varphi\rangle = 0$;
2. $\langle\varphi|\psi\rangle = \langle\psi|\varphi\rangle^*$; and
3. $\langle\varphi|\lambda_1\psi_1 + \lambda_2\psi_2\rangle = \lambda_1\langle\varphi|\psi_1\rangle + \lambda_2\langle\varphi|\psi_2\rangle$

for any $|\varphi\rangle, |\psi\rangle, |\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ and for any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C}$. Sometimes, we also write $(|\varphi\rangle, |\psi\rangle)$ for the inner product $\langle\varphi|\psi\rangle$ of $|\varphi\rangle$ and $|\psi\rangle$.

For any vector $|\psi\rangle$ in $\mathcal{H}$, its length $||\psi||$ is defined to be $\sqrt{\langle\psi|\psi\rangle}$. A vector $|\psi\rangle$ is called a unit vector if $||\psi|| = 1$. Let $\{|\psi_n\rangle\}$ be a sequence of vectors in $\mathcal{H}$ and $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$. If for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a positive integer N such that $||\psi_m - \psi_n|| < \epsilon$ for all $m, n \geq N$, then $\{|\psi_n\rangle\}$ is called a Cauchy sequence. If for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a positive integer N such that $||\psi_n - \psi|| < \epsilon$ for all $n \geq N$, then $|\psi\rangle$ is called a limit of $\{|\psi_n\rangle\}$ and we write $|\psi\rangle = \lim_{n\to\infty} |\psi_n\rangle$.

A family $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i\in I}$ of vectors in $\mathcal{H}$ is said to be summable with the sum $|\psi\rangle$ and we write $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i\in I} |\psi_i\rangle$ if for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is a finite subset J of I such that

$$||\psi - \sum_{i\in K} \psi_i|| < \epsilon$$

for every finite subset K of I containing J. A family $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i\in I}$ of unit vectors is called an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}$ if

1. $|\psi_i\rangle \perp |\psi_j\rangle$ for any $i, j \in I$ with $i \neq j$; and
2. $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i\in I} \langle\psi_i|\psi\rangle|\psi_i\rangle$ for each $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$.

In this case, the cardinality of I is called the dimension of $\mathcal{H}$.

A Hilbert space is defined to be a complete inner product space; that is, an inner product space in which each Cauchy sequence of vectors has a limit. According to a basic postulate of quantum mechanics, the state space of an isolated quantum system is represented by a Hilbert space, and a pure state of the system is described by a unit vector in its state space.

Example 2.1 *1. The state space of qubits is the* $2-$*dimensional Hilbert space:*

$$\mathcal{H}_2 = \{\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle : \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}\}.$$

The inner product in $\mathcal{H}_2$ *is defined by*

$$(\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle, \alpha'|0\rangle + \beta'|1\rangle = \alpha^*\alpha' + \beta^*\beta'$$

for all $\alpha, \alpha', \beta, \beta' \in \mathbb{C}$. *Then* $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ *is an orthonormal basis of* $\mathcal{H}_2$, *called the computational basis.*

2. The space l_2 *of square summable sequences is*

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty = \{\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \alpha_n|n\rangle : \alpha_n \in \mathbb{C} \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |\alpha_n|^2 < \infty\},$$

where $\mathbb{Z}$ *is the set of integers. The inner product in* $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ *is defined by*

$$(\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \alpha_n|n\rangle, \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \alpha'|n\rangle) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \alpha_n^*\alpha_n'$$

for all $\alpha_n, \alpha_n' \in \mathbb{C}$, $-\infty < n < \infty$. *Then* $\{|n\rangle : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ *is an orthonormal basis of* $\mathcal{H}_\infty$, *called the computational basis.*

A (linear) operator on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is a mapping $A : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ satisfying the following conditions:

1. $A(|\varphi\rangle + |\psi\rangle) = A|\varphi\rangle + A|\psi\rangle$;
2. $A(\lambda|\psi\rangle) = \lambda A|\psi\rangle$

for all $|\varphi\rangle, |\psi \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. If $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}$, then an operator A is uniquely determined by the images $\{A|\psi_i\rangle\}$ of basis vectors $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$ under A. In particular, A can be represented by matrix

$$A = (\langle\psi_i|A|\psi_j\rangle)_{ij}$$

when $\mathcal{H}$ is finite-dimensional.

An operator A on $\mathcal{H}$ is said to be bounded if there is a constant $C \geq 0$ such that $\|A|\psi\rangle\| \leq C \cdot \|\psi\|$ for all $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$. In this paper, we only consider bounded operators. We write $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ for the set of bounded operators on $\mathcal{H}$. The identity operator on $\mathcal{H}$ is denoted $I_\mathcal{H}$, and the zero operator on $\mathcal{H}$ that maps every vector in $\mathcal{H}$ to the zero vector is denoted $0_\mathcal{H}$.

For any operator A on $\mathcal{H}$, there exists a unique linear operator $A^\dagger$ on $\mathcal{H}$ such that

$$(|\varphi\rangle, A|\psi\rangle) = (A^\dagger|\psi\rangle, |\varphi\rangle)$$

for all $|\varphi\rangle, |\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$. The operator $A^\dagger$ is called the adjoint of A. An operator M on $\mathcal{H}$ is said to be Hermitian if $M^\dagger = M$.

An operator A on $\mathcal{H}$ is said to be positive if $\langle\psi|A|\psi\rangle \geq 0$ for all states $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$. We can define a partial order between operators, called the Löwner partial order : for any $A, B \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$, $A \sqsubseteq B$ if $B - A$ is a positive operator.

Lemma 2.1 *$A \sqsubseteq B$ if and only if $tr(A\rho) \leq tr(B\rho)$ for all density operators ρ.*

An operator A is said to be a trace operator if $\{\langle\psi_i|A|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i\in I}$ is summable for any orthonormal basis $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i\in I}$ of $\mathcal{H}$; in this case, the trace $tr(A)$ of A is defined to be

$$tr(A) = \sum_i \langle\psi_i|A|\psi_i\rangle$$

where $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}$. It can be shown that $tr(A)$ is independent of the choice of $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$.

A density operator ρ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is defined to be a positive operator with $tr(\rho) = 1$. Then a mixed state of a quantum system with state space $\mathcal{H}$ is described by a density operator on $\mathcal{H}$. In this paper, we take a slightly generalized notion of density operator in the sequel: a partial density operator ρ is a positive with $tr(\rho) \leq 1$. In particular, the zero operator is a partial density operator. The set of partial density operators is denoted $\mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H})$. A partial density operator can also be defined by an ensemble of pure states. Suppose that a quantum system is in one of a number of pure states $|\psi_i\rangle$, with respective probabilities p_i, where it is required that $\sum_i p_i \leq 1$. Then

$$\rho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$$

is a density operator. Conversely, any density operator can be generated in such a way.

2.2 Unitary Transformations

An operator U on $\mathcal{H}$ is called a unitary transformation if $U^\dagger U = Id_\mathcal{H}$, where $Id_\mathcal{H}$ is the identity operator on $\mathcal{H}$; that is, $Id_\mathcal{H}|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$ for all $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$.

Example 2.2 *1. The most frequently used unitary operators on qubits are the Hadamard transformation:*

$$H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and the Pauli matrices:

$$I = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \sigma_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\sigma_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \sigma_z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

2. Let k be an integer. Then the $k-$translation operator on $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ is defined by

$$U_{+k}|n\rangle = |n+k\rangle$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. It is easy to verify that U_{+k} is a unitary operator.

The basic postulate of quantum mechanics about evolution of systems may be stated as follows: Suppose that the states of a closed quantum system at times t_0 and t are $|\psi_0\rangle$ and $|\psi\rangle$, respectively. Then they are related to each other by a unitary operator U which depends only on the times t_0 and t,

$$|\psi\rangle = U|\psi_0\rangle.$$

This postulate can be reformulated in the language of density operators as follows: The state ρ of a closed quantum system at time t is related to its state ρ_0 at time t_0 by a unitary operator U which depends only on the times t and t_0,

$$\rho = U\rho_0 U^\dagger.$$

2.3 Quantum Measurements

A quantum measurement on a system with state space $\mathcal{H}$ is described by a collection $\{M_m\}$ of operators on $\mathcal{H}$ satisfying

$$\sum_m M_m^\dagger M_m = Id_{\mathcal{H}},$$

where M_m are called measurement operators, and the index m stands for the measurement outcomes that may occur in the experiment. If the state of a quantum system is $|\psi\rangle$ immediately before the measurement, then the probability that result m occurs is

$$p(m) = \langle\psi|M_m^\dagger M_m|\psi\rangle$$

and the state of the system after the measurement is

$$|\psi_m\rangle = \frac{M_m|\psi\rangle}{\sqrt{p(m)}}.$$

We can also formulate the quantum measurement postulate in the language of density operators. If the state of a quantum system was ρ immediately before measurement $\{M_m\}$ is performed on it, then the probability that result m occur is

$$p(m) = tr(M_m^\dagger M_m \rho),$$

and the state of the system after the measurement is

$$\rho_m = \frac{M_m \rho M_m^\dagger}{p(m)}.$$

A special class of quantum measurements will be frequently used in the sequel: If a measurement M has only two outcomes, say 0 and 1; that is, $M = \{M_0, M_1\}$, then we often call M a yes-no measurement, with 0 corresponding to "no"and 1 to "yes".

2.4 Tensor Products of Hilbert Spaces

The state space of a composite quantum system is the tensor product of the state spaces of its components. In this subsection, we recall the definition of the tensor product of a family $\{\mathcal{H}_i\}$ of Hilbert spaces. For simplicity of presentation, it will be assumed that the set of quantum variables is countably infinite, and the type of each quantum variable is either **Boolean** or **integer** (see next section). Thus, we only need to consider a finite or countably infinite family $\{\mathcal{H}_i\}$ where each $\mathcal{H}_i$ is finite-dimensional or countably infinite-dimensional. A more general notion of tensor product introduced by von Neumann [21] should be adopted in order to generalize the results obtained in this paper to the case of more quantum variables and other types.

Let $\{|\psi_{ij_i}\rangle\}$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}_i$ for each i. We write $\mathcal{B}$ for the set of tensor products of basis vectors of all $\mathcal{H}_i$; that is,

$$\mathcal{B} = \{\bigotimes_i |\psi_{ij_i}\rangle\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{B}$ is a countably infinite set, and it can be written in the form of a sequence of vectors:

$$\mathcal{B} = \{|\varphi_n\rangle : n = 0, 1, ...\}.$$

The tensor product of $\{\mathcal{H}_i\}$ is defined to be the Hilbert space spanned by $\mathcal{B}$, i.e.

$$\bigotimes_i \mathcal{H}_i = \{\sum_n |\varphi_n\rangle : \alpha_n \in \mathbb{C} \text{ for all } n \geq 0 \text{ and } \sum_n |\alpha_n|^2 < \infty\}.$$

We define the inner product in $\bigotimes_i \mathcal{H}_i$ as follows:

$$(\sum_n \alpha_n |\psi_n\rangle, \sum_n \alpha'_n |\psi_n\rangle) = \sum_n \alpha_n^* \alpha'_n$$

for any $\alpha_n, \alpha'_n \in \mathbb{C}$, $n \geq 0$. It is easy to see that $\bigotimes_i \mathcal{H}_i$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{H}_\infty$.

The notion of partial trace is very useful for description of a subsystem of a composite quantum system. Let $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{K}$ be two Hilbert spaces and operator $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K})$. Then the partial trace of A on $\mathcal{H}$ is defined to be

$$tr_{\mathcal{K}}(A) = \sum_i (I_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes \langle\psi_i|)\rho(I_{\mathcal{H}} \otimes |\psi_i\rangle),$$

which is an operator on $\mathcal{H}$, where $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{K}$. It can be shown that $tr_{\mathcal{K}}(A)$ does not depend on choice of $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$. In particular, if $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ are the state spaces of quantum systems q_1 and q_2, respectively, and the state of their composite system q_1q_2 is described by a density operator $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2)$, then $tr_{\mathcal{H}_2}(\rho)$ is the description for the state of component system q_1.

3 Syntax of Quantum Programs

We assume a countably infinite set Var of quantum variables. The symbols q, q', q'', $q_0, q_1, q_2, ...$ will be used as meta-variables ranging over quantum variables. Recall that in classical computation, we use a type to denote the domain of a variable. Thus, in quantum computation, a type should be the state space of a quantum system denoted by some quantum variable. Formally, a type t is a name of a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_t$. In this paper, we only consider two basic types: **Boolean**, **integer**. The results obtained in this paper can be easily generalized to the case with more types. The Hilbert spaces denoted by **Boolean** and **integer** are:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{Boolean}} = \mathcal{H}_2,$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{integer}} = \mathcal{H}_\infty.$$

Note that the sets denoted by types **Boolean** and **integer** in classical computation are exactly the computational bases of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{Boolean}}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{integer}}$, respectively (see Example 2.1). Now we assume that each quantum variable q has a type $type(q)$, which is either **Boolean** or **integer**. The state space $\mathcal{H}_q$ of a quantum variable q is the Hilbert space denoted by its type; that is,

$$\mathcal{H}_q = \mathcal{H}_{type(q)}.$$

A quantum register is defined to be a finite sequence of distinct quantum variables. The state space of a quantum register $\overline{q} = q_1, ..., q_n$ is the tensor product of the state spaces of the quantum variables occurring in $\overline{q}$; that is,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\overline{q}} = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{H}_{q_i}.$$

Now we are able to define the syntax of quantum programs. The quantum programs considered in this paper are quantum extension of classical **while**-programs. Formally, they are generated by the following grammar:

$$S ::= \mathbf{skip} \mid q := 0 \mid \overline{q} := U\overline{q} \mid S_1; S_2 \mid \mathbf{measure}\ M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S} \mid \mathbf{while}\ M[\overline{q}] = 1\ \mathbf{do}\ S$$

where

- q is a quantum variable and $\overline{q}$ a quantum register;

- U in the statement "$\overline{q} := U\overline{q}$"is a unitary operator on $\mathcal{H}_{\overline{q}}$. In particular, if $type(q) = \mathbf{integer}$, then the statement $q := U_{+k}q$, where U_{+k} is the $k-$translation operator, will be often abbreviated to $q := q + k$;

- in the statement "**measure** $M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}$", $M = \{M_m\}$ is a measurement on the state space $\mathcal{H}_{\overline{q}}$ of $\overline{q}$, and $S = \{S_m\}$ is a set of quantum programs such that each outcome m of measurement M corresponds to S_m;

- $M = \{M_0, M_1\}$ in the statement "**while** $M[\overline{q}] = 1$ **do** S"is a yes-no measurement on $\mathcal{H}_{\overline{q}}$.

The intuitive meaning of these quantum program constructs will become clear after introducing their operational semantics in the next section.

The following technical definition will be needed in the sequel.

Definition 3.1 *The set $var(S)$ of quantum variables in quantum program S is recursively defined as follows:*

1. *If $S =$ **skip**, then $var(S) = \emptyset$;*
2. *If $S = q := 0$, then $var(S) = \{q\}$;*
3. *If $S = \overline{q} := U\overline{q}$, then $var(S) = \{\overline{q}\}$;*
4. *If $S = S_1; S_2$, then $var(S) = var(S_1) \cup var(S_2)$;*
5. *If $S =$ **measure** $M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}$, then*
$$var(S) = \{\overline{q}\} \cup \bigcup_m var(S_m);$$
6. *If $S =$ **while** $M[\overline{q}] = 1$ **do** S, then $var(S) = \{\overline{q}\} \cup var(S)$.*

4 Operational Semantics of Quantum Programs

We write $\mathcal{H}_{\rm all}$ for the tensor product of the state spaces of all quantum variables, that is,
$$\mathcal{H}_{\rm all} = \bigotimes_{\text{all } q} \mathcal{H}_q.$$
For simplicity of presentation, we will use E to denote the empty program. A quantum configuration is a pair $\langle S, \rho\rangle$, where S is a quantum program or E, $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{\rm all})$ is a partial density operator on $\mathcal{H}_{\rm all}$, and it is used to indicate the (global) state of quantum variables.

Let $\overline{q} = q_1, ..., q_n$ be a quantum register. A linear operator A on $\mathcal{H}_{\overline{q}}$ has a cylinder extension
$$A \otimes I_{Var-\{\overline{q}\}} \tag{1}$$

on $\mathcal{H}_{\rm all}$, where $I_{Var-\{\overline{q}\}}$ is the identity operator on the Hilbert space

$$\bigotimes_{q\in Var-\{\overline{q}\}} \mathcal{H}_q.$$

In the sequel, we will simply for A for its extension (1), and it can be easily recognized from the context, without any risk of confusion.

The operational semantics of quantum program is defined to be a transition relation $\rightarrow$ between quantum configurations. By a transition

$$\langle S,\rho\rangle \rightarrow \langle S',\rho'\rangle$$

we mean that after executing quantum program S one step in state ρ, the state of quantum variables becomes ρ', and S' is the remainder of S still to be executed. In particular, if $S'=E$, then S terminates in state ρ'. The transition relation $\rightarrow$ is given by the transition rules in Fig.1.

The meanings of various program constructs are precisely specified by the transitional rules in Fig.1. The statement "**skip**"does nothing and terminates immediately. The initialization "$q:=0$"sets quantum variable q to the basis state $|0\rangle$. To see the role of initialization more clearly, we consider the case of $type(q)=$ **integer** as an example. First, suppose ρ is a pure state; that is, $\rho=|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ for some $|\psi\rangle\in\mathcal{H}_{\rm all}$. We can write $|\psi\rangle$ in the form:

$$|\psi\rangle=\sum_k \alpha_k|\psi_k\rangle,$$

where $|\psi_k\rangle$ is a product state, say

$$|\psi_k\rangle=\bigotimes_{\text{all } q'}|\psi_{kq'}\rangle.$$

Then

$$\rho=\sum_{k,l}\alpha_k\alpha_l^*|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_l|.$$

After the initialization the state becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_0^q &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}|0\rangle_q\langle n|\rho|n\rangle_n\langle 0| \\
&= \sum_{k,l}\alpha_k\alpha_l^*\Big(\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}|0\rangle_q\langle n|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_l|n\rangle_q\langle 0|\Big) \\
&= \sum_{k,l}\alpha_k\alpha_l^*\Big(\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}\langle\psi_{lq}|n\rangle\langle n|\psi_{kq}\rangle\Big)\Big(|0\rangle_q\langle 0|\otimes\bigotimes_{q'\neq q}|\psi_{kq'}\rangle\langle\psi_{lq'}|\Big) \\
&= \sum_{k,l}\alpha_k\alpha_l^*\langle\psi_{lq}|\psi_{kq}\rangle\Big(|0\rangle_q\langle 0|\otimes\bigotimes_{q'\neq q}|\psi_{kq'}\rangle\langle\psi_{lq'}|\Big) \\
&= |0\rangle_q\langle 0|\otimes\Big(\sum_{k,l}\alpha_k\alpha_l^*\langle\psi_{lq}|\psi_{kq}\rangle\bigotimes_{q'\neq q}|\psi_{kq'}\rangle\langle\psi_{lq'}|\Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

In general, suppose ρ is generated by an ensemble $\{(p_i, |\psi_i\rangle)\}$ of pure states, that is,

$$\rho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|.$$

For each i, we write $\rho_i = |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ and assume that it becomes ρ_{i0}^q after the initialization. By the above argument, we can write ρ_{i0} in the form:

$$\rho_{i0}^q = \sum_k \alpha_{ik}(|0\rangle_q\langle 0| \otimes |\varphi_{ik}\rangle\langle\varphi_{ik}|),$$

where $|\varphi_{ik}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{var-\{q\}}$ for all k. Then the initialization makes that ρ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_0^q &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |0\rangle_q\langle n|\rho|n\rangle_q\langle 0| \\ &= \sum_i p_i (\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |0\rangle_q\langle n|\rho_i|n\rangle_q\langle 0|) \\ &= \sum_{i,k} p_i \alpha_{ik}(|0\rangle_q\langle 0| \otimes |\varphi_{ik}\rangle\langle\varphi_{ik}|). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

From Eqs. (2) and (3) we see that the state of q is set to be $|0\rangle$ and the states of the other quantum variables are unchanged. The statement "$\overline{q} := U\overline{q}$"simply means that unitary transformation U is performed on quantum register $\overline{q}$, leaving the states of the quantum variables not in $\overline{q}$ unchanged. Remark that U in the target configuration of the rule (Unitary Transformation) stands indeed for the cylinder extension of U on $\mathcal{H}_{all}$ (see Eq. (1)). A similar remark applies to the rules for measurements and loops. Sequential composition is similar to its counterpart in classical computation. The program construct "**measure** $M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}$"is a quantum generalization of classical conditional statement. Recall that the first step of the execution of conditional statement "**if** B **then** S_1 **else** S_2 **fi**"is to check whether Boolean expression B is satisfied. However, according to a basic postulate of quantum mechanics, the unique way to acquire information about a quantum system is to perform a measurement on it. So, in executing the statement "**measure** $M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}$", quantum measurement M will first be performed on quantum register $\overline{q}$, and then a subprogram S_m in $\overline{S}$ will be selected to be executed next according to the outcome of measurement. The essential difference between a measurement statement and a classical conditional statement is that the state of program variables is changed after performing the measurement in the former, whereas it is not changed after checking the Boolean expression in the latter. Note that the outcome m is observed with probability

$$p_m = tr(M_m \rho M_m^\dagger),$$

and after the measurement the state becomes

$$\rho_m = M_m \rho M_m^\dagger / p_m.$$

So, a natural presentation of the Measurement rule is the probabilistic transition:

$$\overline{\langle \textbf{measure } M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}, \rho\rangle \overset{p_m}{\to} \langle S_m, \rho_m\rangle}$$

However, we adopt Selinger's suggestion [19] of encoding both probability p_m and density operator ρ_m into partial density operator

$$M_m \rho M_m^\dagger = p_m \rho_m.$$

This allows us to give the Measurement rule in terms of ordinary transition. The statement "**while** $M[\overline{q}] = 1$ **do** S"is a quantum generalization of classical loop "**while** B **do** S **od**". To acquire information about quantum register $\overline{q}$, a measurement M is performed on it. The measurement M is a yes-no measurement with only two possible outcomes $0, 1$. If the outcome 0 (no) is observed, then the program terminates, and if the outcome 1 (yes) occurs, then the program executes the subprogram S and continues. The only difference between a quantum loop and a classical loop is that checking the loop guard B in a classical loop does not change the state of program variables, but in a quantum loop the measurement outcomes 0 and 1 occur with probabilities:

$$p_0 = tr(M_0 \rho M_0^\dagger), \quad p_1 = tr(M_1 \rho M_1^\dagger),$$

respectively, and the state becomes $M_0 \rho M_0^\dagger$ from ρ when the outcome is 0, and it becomes $M_1 \rho M_1^\dagger$ when the outcome is 1. Again, we adopt Selinger's suggestion so that the (Loop 0) and (Loop 1) rules can be stated as ordinary transitions instead of probabilistic transitions.

Let S be a quantum program and $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H})$. If $\langle S', \rho'\rangle$ can be reached from $\langle S, \rho\rangle$ in n steps in the transition relation $\to$; that is, there are configurations $\langle S_1, \rho_1\rangle, ..., \langle S_{n-1}, \rho_{n-1}\rangle$ such that

$$\langle S, \rho\rangle \to \langle S_1, \rho_1\rangle \to ... \to \langle S_{n-1}, \rho_{n-1}\rangle \to \langle S', \rho'\rangle,$$

then we write:

$$\langle S, \rho\rangle \to^n \langle S', \rho'\rangle.$$

A transition sequence of S starting in ρ is a finite or infinite sequence of configurations in the following form:

$$\langle S, \rho\rangle \to \langle S_1, \rho_1\rangle \to ... \to \langle S_n, \rho_n\rangle \to \langle S_{n+1}, \rho_{n+1}\rangle \to ....$$

If it cannot be extended, then it is called a computation of S starting in ρ. Moveover, if it is finite and its last configuration is $\langle E, \rho'\rangle$, then we say that it terminates in ρ'; and if it is infinite, then we say that it diverges. We say that S can diverge from ρ whenever it has a diverging computation starting in ρ.

Classical **while**-programs are a typical class of deterministic programs that have exactly one computation starting in a given state. As shown in the following example, however, quantum **while**-programs no longer possess such a determinism because probabilism is introduced by the measurements in the statements

"**measure** $M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}$"and "**while** $M[\overline{q}] = 1$ **do** S". After encoding probabilities into partial density operators, probabilism manifests as nondeterminism in transition rules (Measurement), (Loop 0) and (Loop 2).

Example 4.1 *Suppose that* $type(q_1) =$ **Boolean** *and* $type(q_2) =$ **integer**. *Consider the program:*

$$S = q_1 := 0; q_2 := 0; q_1 := Hq_1; q_2 := q_2 + 2; \textbf{measure } M[q_1] : \overline{S}$$

where

- *M is the measurement according to the computational basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ of $\mathcal{H}_2$; that is, $M = \{M_0, M_1\}$, $M_0 = |0\rangle\langle 0|$ and $M_1 = |1\rangle\langle 1|$;*
- *$\overline{S} = S_1, S_2$, and*
  - *$S_1 =$* **skip***;*
  - *$S_2 =$* **while** $N[q_2] = 1$ **do** $q_1 := \sigma_z q_1$, *where $N = \{N_0, N_1\}$,*

$$N_0 = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{0} |n\rangle\langle n| \text{ and } N_1 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |n\rangle\langle n|.$$

Let

$$\rho_0 = \bigotimes_{q \neq q_1, q_2} |0\rangle_q\langle 0|$$

and

$$\rho = |1\rangle_{q_1}\langle 1| \otimes |-1\rangle_{q_2}\langle -1| \otimes \rho_0.$$

Then the computations of S starting in ρ are:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle S, \rho\rangle &\to \langle q_2 := 0; q_1 := Hq_1; q_2 := q_2 + 2; \textbf{measure}, \rho_1\rangle \\
&\to \langle q_1 := Hq_1; q_2 := q_2 + 2; \textbf{measure}, \rho_2\rangle \\
&\to \langle q_2 := q_2 + 2; \textbf{measure}, \rho_3\rangle \\
&\to \langle \textbf{measure}, \rho_4\rangle \\
&\to \begin{cases} \langle S_1, \rho_5\rangle \to \langle E, \rho_5\rangle, \\ \langle S_2, \rho_6\rangle, \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle S_2, \rho_6\rangle &\to \langle q_1 := \sigma_z q_1; S_2, \rho_6\rangle \\
&\to \langle S_2, -\rho_6\rangle \\
&\to ... \\
&\to^{2n-1} \langle q_1 := \sigma_z q_1; S_2, (-1)^{n-1}\rho_6\rangle \\
&\to \langle S_2, (-1)^n \rho_6\rangle \\
&\to ...
\end{aligned}$$

where **measure** *stands for the statement "***measure** $M[q_1] : \overline{S}$*", and*

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_1 &= |0\rangle_{q_1}\langle 0| \otimes |-1\rangle_{q_2}\langle -1| \otimes \rho_0,\\
\rho_2 &= |0\rangle_{q_1}\langle 0| \otimes |0\rangle_{q_2}\langle 0| \otimes \rho_0,\\
\rho_3 &= |+\rangle_{q_1}\langle +| \otimes |0\rangle_{q_2}\langle 0| \otimes \rho_0,\\
\rho_4 &= |+\rangle_{q_1}\langle +| \otimes |2\rangle_{q_2}\langle 2| \otimes \rho_0,\\
\rho_5 &= \frac{1}{2}|0\rangle_{q_1}\langle 0| \otimes |2\rangle_{q_2}\langle 2| \otimes \rho_0,\\
\rho_6 &= \frac{1}{2}|1\rangle_{q_1}\langle 1| \otimes |2\rangle_{q_2}\langle 2| \otimes \rho_0.
\end{aligned}$$

So, S can diverge from ρ. Note that S_2 has also the transition

$$\langle S_2, (-1)^n\rho_6\rangle \to \langle E, 0_{\mathcal{H}_{all}}\rangle,$$

but we always discard the transitions in which the partial density operator of the target configuration is zero operator.

5 Denotational Semantics of Quantum Programs

The denotational semantics of a quantum program is defined to be a semantic function which maps partial density operators to themselves. More precisely, for any quantum program S, the semantic function of S sums the computated results of all terminating computations of S.

We write $\to^*$ for the reflexive and transitive closures of $\to$; that is, $\langle S, \rho\rangle \to^* \langle S', \rho'\rangle$ if and only if $\langle S, \rho\rangle \to^n \langle S', \rho'\rangle$ for some $n \geq 0$.

Definition 5.1 *Let S be a quantum program. Then its semantic function*

$$[|S|] : \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{\rm all}) \to \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{\rm all})$$

is defined by

$$[|S|](\rho) = \sum\{|\rho' : \langle S, \rho\rangle \to^* \langle E, \rho'\rangle|\} \tag{4}$$

for all $\rho \in \mathcal{H}_{\rm all}$.

It should be pointed out that $\{|\cdot|\}$ in Eq. (4) stands for multi-set. The reason for using multi-sets is that the same density operator may be obtained through different computational paths as we can see from the measurement and loop rules in the operational semantics. The following simple example illustrates the case more explicitly.

Example 5.1 *Assume that type(q) =* **Boolean***. Consider the program:*

$$S = q := 0; q := Hq; \textbf{measure}\ M[q] : \overline{S},$$

where

- *M is the measurement according to the computational basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ of $\mathcal{H}_2$;*
- *$\overline{S} = S_0, S_1$, $S_0 = q := Iq$ and $S_1 = q := \sigma_x q$.*

Let $\rho = |0\rangle_{\text{all}}\langle 0|$, where

$$|0\rangle_{\text{all}} = \bigotimes_{\text{all } q} |0\rangle_q.$$

Then the computation of S starting in ρ is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle S, \rho\rangle &\to \langle q := Hq; \textbf{measure}, \rho\rangle \\ &\to \langle \textbf{measure}, |+\rangle_q\langle +| \otimes \bigotimes_{q' \neq q} |0\rangle_{q'}\langle 0|\rangle \\ &\to \begin{cases} \langle S_0, \frac{1}{2}|0\rangle_q\langle 0| \otimes \bigotimes_{q' \neq q} |0\rangle_{q'}\langle 0|\rangle \to \langle E, \frac{1}{2}\rho\rangle, \\ \langle S_1, \frac{1}{2}|1\rangle_q\langle 1| \otimes \bigotimes_{q' \neq q} |0\rangle_{q'}\langle 0|\rangle \to \langle E, \frac{1}{2}\rho\rangle, \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

where **measure** *is an abbreviation of "***measure** *$M[q] : \overline{S}$". So, we have:*

$$[|S|](\rho) = \frac{1}{2}\rho + \frac{1}{2}\rho = \rho.$$

Now we are going to establish some basic properties of semantic functions. First, we prove its linearity.

Lemma 5.1 *Let $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathcal{D}^-(D)$ and $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \geq 0$. If $\lambda_1\rho_1 + \lambda_2\rho_2 \in \mathcal{D}^-(D)$, then for any quantum program S, we have:*

$$[|S|](\lambda_1\rho_1 + \lambda_2\rho_2) = \lambda_1[|S|](\rho_1) + \lambda_2[|S|](\rho_2).$$

Proof. We can easily prove the following fact by induction on the structure of S:

- Claim: If $\langle S, \rho_1\rangle \to \langle S', \rho_1'\rangle$ and $\langle S, \rho_2\rangle \to \langle S', \rho_2'\rangle$, then

$$\langle S, \lambda_1\rho_1 + \lambda_2\rho_2\rangle \to \langle S', \lambda_1\rho_1' + \lambda_2\rho_2'\rangle.$$

Then the conclusion immediately follows. □

Next we give a representation of semantic function $[|S|]$ according to the structure of program S. To do this for quantum loops, we need some auxiliary notations. Let Ω be a quantum program such that $[|\Omega|] = 0_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{all}}}$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$; for example,

$$\Omega = \textbf{while } M_{\text{trivial}}[q] = 1 \textbf{ do skip},$$

where q is a quantum variable, and

$$M_{\text{trivial}} = \{M_0 = 0_{\mathcal{H}_q}, M_1 = I_{\mathcal{H}_q}\}$$

is a trivial measurement on $\mathcal{H}_q$. We set:

$$(\textbf{while } M[\overline{q}] = 1 \textbf{ do } S)^0 = \Omega,$$
$$(\textbf{while } M[\overline{q}] = 1 \textbf{ do } S)^{n+1} = \textbf{measure } M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S},$$

where $\overline{S} = S_0, S_1$, and

$$S_0 = \textbf{skip},$$
$$S_1 = S; (\textbf{while } M[\overline{q}] = 1 \textbf{ do } S)^n$$

for all $n \geq 0$.

Proposition 5.1 *1.* $[|\textbf{skip}|](\rho) = \rho$.

2. If $type(q) = \textbf{Boolean}$, *then*

$$[|q := 0|](\rho) = |0\rangle_q\langle 0|\rho|0\rangle_q\langle 0| + |0\rangle_q\langle 1|\rho|1\rangle_q\langle 0|,$$

and if $type(q) = \textbf{integer}$, *then*

$$[|q := 0|](\rho) \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |0\rangle_q\langle n|\rho|n\rangle_q\langle 0|.$$

3. $[|\overline{q} := U\overline{q}|](\rho) = U\rho U^\dagger$.

4. $[|S_1; S_2|](\rho) = [|S_2|]([|S_1|](\rho))$.

5. $[|\textbf{measure } M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}|](\rho) = \sum_m [|S_m|](M_m\rho M_m^\dagger)$.

6. $[|\textbf{while } M[\overline{q}] = 1 \textbf{ do } S|](\rho) = \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty}[|(\textbf{while } M[\overline{q}] = 1 \textbf{ do } S)^n|](\rho)$.

Proof. (1), (2) and (3) are obvious.

(4) By Lemma 5.1 and the transitional rule for sequential composition we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
[|S_2|]([|S_1|](\rho)) &= [|S_2|](\sum\{|\rho_1 : \langle S_1, \rho\rangle \to^* \langle E, \rho_1\rangle|\}) \\
&= \sum\{|[|S_2|](\rho_1) : \langle S_1, \rho\rangle \to^* \langle E, \rho_1\rangle|\} \\
&= \sum\{|\,|\sum\{|\rho' : \langle S_2, \rho_1\rangle \to^* \langle E, \rho'\rangle|\} : \langle S_1, \rho\rangle \to^* \langle E, \rho_1\rangle|\} \\
&= \sum\{|\rho' : \langle S_1, \rho\rangle \to^* \langle E, \rho_1\rangle \text{ and } \langle S_2, \rho_1\rangle \to^* \langle E, \rho'\rangle|\} \\
&= \sum\{|\rho' : \langle S_1; S_2, \rho\rangle \to^* \langle E, \rho'\rangle|\} \\
&= [|S_1; S_2|](\rho).
\end{aligned}$$

(5) follows immediately from the transitional rule for measurement.

(6) We introduce two auxiliary operators:

$$\mathcal{E}_i : \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{\text{all}}) \to \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{\text{all}}),$$

$$\mathcal{E}_i(\rho) = M_i \rho M_i^\dagger$$

for all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H})$ and $i = 0, 1$. For simplicity, we write **while** for "**while** $M[\overline{q}] = 1$ **do** S". First, we prove:

$$[|(\textbf{while})^n|](\rho) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} [\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k](\rho)$$

for all $n \geq 1$ by induction on n. The case of $n = 1$ is obvious. Then by (1), (4) and (5) and the induction hypothesis on $n - 1$ we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
[|(\textbf{while})^n|](\rho) &= [|\textbf{skip}|](\mathcal{E}_0(\rho)) + [|S; (\textbf{while})^n|](\mathcal{E}_1(\rho)) \\
&= \mathcal{E}_0(\rho) + [|(\textbf{while})^{n-1}|](([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)(\rho)) \\
&= \mathcal{E}_0(\rho) + \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} [\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k](([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_0)(\rho)) \qquad (5) \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} [\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k](\rho).
\end{aligned}$$

Second, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
[|\textbf{while}|](\rho) &= \sum \{|\rho' : \langle \textbf{while}, \rho \rangle \to^* \langle E, \rho' \rangle|\} \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum \{|\rho' : \langle \textbf{while}, \rho \rangle \to^n \langle E, \rho' \rangle|\}.
\end{aligned}$$

So, it suffices to show that

$$\sum \{|\rho' : \langle \textbf{while}, \rho \rangle \to^n \langle E, \rho' \rangle|\} = [\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^{n-1}](\rho)$$

for all $n \geq 1$. This can be easily done by induction on n. □

If we only consider quantum variables of type **Boolean**, then the above proposition coincides with Fig.1 in [11]. However, it is worth noting that in [11] the denotational semantics of quantum programs was directly defined and it lacks a basis of operational semantics. Similar to Lemma 3.2 in [11], we may prove that the semantic function of a quantum program is a super-operator. Thus, the denotational semantics given in this section is consistent with Selinger's idea of modeling quantum programs as super-operators [19].

A recursive characterization of the semantic function of a quantum loop can be derived from the above proposition.

Corollary 5.1 *If we write* **while** *for quantum loop "***while** $M[\overline{q}] = 1$ **do** S*", then for any* $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^{-}(\mathcal{H}_{all})$*, it holds that*

$$[|\textbf{while}|](\rho) = M_0 \rho M_0^{\dagger} + [|\textbf{while}|]([|S|](M_1 \rho M_1^{\dagger})).$$

*Proof.*Immediate from Proposition 5.1(6) and Eq. (5). □

The following proposition shows that a semantic function does not increase the trace of density operator of quantum variables.

Proposition 5.2 *For any quantum program* S*, it holds that*

$$tr([|S|](\rho)) \leq tr(\rho)$$

for all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^{-}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{all}})$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on the structure of S.

Case 1. $S =$ **skip**. Obvious.

Case 2. $S = q := 0$. If $type(q) =$ **integer**, then

$$\begin{aligned} tr([|S|](\rho)) &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} tr(|0\rangle_q \langle n|\rho|n\rangle_n \langle 0|) \\ &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} tr({}_q\langle 0|0\rangle_q \langle n|\rho|n\rangle_q) \\ &= tr[(\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |n\rangle_q \langle n|)\rho] = tr(\rho). \end{aligned}$$

It can be proved in a similar way when $type(q) =$ **Boolean**.

Case 3. $S = \overline{q} := U\overline{q}$. Then

$$tr([|S|](\rho) = tr(U\rho U^{\dagger}) = tr(U^{\dagger}U\rho) = tr(\rho).$$

Case 4. $S = S_1; S_2$. It follows from the induction hypothesis on S_1 and S_2 that

$$\begin{aligned} tr([|S|](\rho)) &= tr([|S_2|]([|S_1|](\rho))) \\ &\leq tr([|S_1|](\rho)) \\ &\leq tr(\rho). \end{aligned}$$

Case 5. $S =$ **measure** $M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}$. Then by induction hypothesis we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} tr([|S|](\rho)) &= \sum_m tr([|S_m|](M_m \rho M_m^{\dagger})) \\ &\leq \sum_m tr(M_m \rho M_m^{\dagger}) \\ &= tr[(\sum_m M_m^{\dagger} M_m)\rho] \\ &= tr(\rho). \end{aligned}$$

Case 6. $S = \textbf{while}\ M[\overline{q}] = 1\ \textbf{do}\ S'$. We write $(\textbf{while})^n$ for statement "$(\textbf{while}\ M[\overline{q}] = 1\ \textbf{do}\ S')^n$". With Proposition 5.1(6), it suffices to show that

$$tr([|(\textbf{while})^n|](\rho)) \leq tr(\rho)$$

for all $n \geq 0$. This can be carried out by induction on n. The case of $n = 0$ is obvious. By the induction hypothesis on n and S', we have:

$$\begin{aligned} tr([|(\textbf{while})^{n+1}|](\rho)) &= tr(M_0\rho M_0^\dagger) + tr([|(\textbf{while})^n|]_{\text{par}}([|S'|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger))) \\ &\leq tr(M_0\rho M_0^\dagger) + tr([|S'|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger)) \\ &\leq tr(M_0\rho M_0^\dagger) + tr(M_1\rho M_1^\dagger) \\ &= tr[(M_0^\dagger M_0 + M_1^\dagger M_1)\rho] \\ &= tr(\rho).\ \square \end{aligned}$$

From the proof of the above proposition, it is easy to see that the unique possibility that $tr([|S|](\rho)) < tr(\rho)$ comes from the quantum loops occurring in S. Thus, $tr(\rho) - tr([|S|](\rho))$ is the probability that program S diverges from input state ρ. This can be further illustrated by the following example.

Example 5.2 *Let type*$(q) = \textbf{integer}$*, and let*

$$M_0 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{\frac{n-1}{2n}}(|n\rangle\langle n| + |-n\rangle\langle -n|),$$

$$M_1 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{\frac{n+1}{2n}}(|n\rangle\langle n| + |-n\rangle\langle -n|) + |0\rangle\langle 0|.$$

Then $M = \{M_0, M_1\}$ *is a yes-no measurement on* $\mathcal{H}_q$*. Consider the program:*

$$\textbf{while}\ M[q] = 1\ \textbf{do}\ q := q + 1.$$

For simplicity, we write **while** *for this program. Let*

$$\rho_0 = \bigotimes_{q' \neq q} |0\rangle_{q'}\langle 0|$$

and $\rho = |0\rangle_q\langle 0| \otimes \rho_0$*. Then*

$$[|(\textbf{while})^n|](\rho) = \begin{cases} 0_{\mathcal{H}_{\text{all}}} & \text{if } n = 0, 1, 2, \\ \frac{1}{2}(\sum_{k=2}^{n-1} \frac{k-1}{k!}|k\rangle_q\langle k|) \otimes \rho_0 & \text{if } n \geq 3, \end{cases}$$

$$[|\textbf{while}|](\rho) = \frac{1}{2}(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{n-1}{n!}|n\rangle_q\langle n|) \otimes \rho_0,$$

and

$$tr([|\textbf{while}|](\rho)) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{n-1}{n!} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

This means that program **while** *terminates on input* ρ *with probability* $\frac{1}{2}$*, and it diverges from input* ρ *with probability* $\frac{1}{2}$*.*

To conclude this section, we observe how quantum programs change the states of quantum variables and how they access quantum variables.

Let $X \subseteq Var$ be a set of quantum variables. For any $A \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{all})$, we write $tr_X(A)$ for

$$tr_{\bigotimes_{q \in X} \mathcal{H}_q}(A).$$

Proposition 5.3 *1.* $tr_{var(S)}([\![S]\!](\rho)) = tr_{var(S)}(\rho)$.

2. If $tr_{Var-var(S)}(\rho_1) = tr_{Var-var(S)}(\rho_2)$, *then*

$$tr_{Var-var(S)}([\![S]\!](\rho_1)) = tr_{Var-var(S)}([\![S]\!](\rho_2)).$$

We put the long and dumb proof of the above proposition into the appendix.

Recall that $tr_X(\rho)$ describes the state of the quantum variables not in X when the global state of all quantum variables is ρ. So, Proposition 5.3(1) indicates that the state of the quantum variables not in $var(S)$ after implementing quantum program S is the same as that before implementing S. This means that program S can only change the state of quantum variables in $var(S)$. On the other hand, Proposition 5.3(2) shows that if two input states ρ_1 and ρ_2 coincide on the quantum variables in $var(S)$, then the computed outcomes of S, starting in ρ_1 and ρ_2, respectively, will also coincide on these quantum variables. In other words, program S can access at most the quantum variables in $var(S)$.

6 Correctness Formulas

Correctness of a quantum program will be expressed by a quantum extension of Hoare triple in which a quantum predicate describes the input state and a quantum predicate describes the output states of the program. We adopt D'Hondt and Panangaden's definition of quantum predicates [10]. For any $X \subseteq Var$, a quantum predicate on $\mathcal{H}_X$ is defined to be a Hermitian operator P on $\mathcal{H}_X$ such that

$$0_{\mathcal{H}_X} \sqsubseteq P \sqsubseteq I_{\mathcal{H}_X}.$$

We write $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_X)$ for the set of quantum predicates on $\mathcal{H}_X$. Intuitively, for any $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_X)$, $tr(P\rho)$ stands for the probability that predicate P is satisfied in state ρ.

A correctness formula is a statement of the form:

$$\{P\}S\{Q\}$$

where S is a quantum program, and both P and Q are quantum predicates on $\mathcal{H}_{all}$. The quantum predicate P is called the precondition of the correctness formula and Q the postcondition. A correctness formula can be interpreted in two different ways:

Definition 6.1 *1. The correctness formula $\{P\}S\{Q\}$ is true in the sense of total correctness, written*

$$\models_{\rm tot} \{P\}S\{Q\},$$

if we have:

$$tr(P\rho) \leq tr(Q[|S|](\rho))$$

for all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H})$.

2. The correctness formula $\{P\}S\{Q\}$ is true in the sense of partial correctness, written

$$\models_{\rm par} \{P\}S\{Q\},$$

if we have:

$$tr(P\rho) \leq tr(Q[|S|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|S|](\rho))]$$

for all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H})$.

The intuitive meaning of the defining inequality of total correctness is: the probability that input ρ satisfies quantum predicate P is not greater than the probability that quantum program S terminates on ρ and its output $[|S|](\rho)$ satisfies quantum predicate Q. Recall that $tr(\rho) - tr([|S|](\rho))$ is the probability that quantum program S diverges from input ρ. Thus, the definition inequality of partial correctness means: if input ρ satisfies predicate P, then either program S terminates on it and its output $[|S|](\rho)$ satisfies Q, or S diverges from it. The difference between total correctness and partial correctness is illustrated well by the following simple example.

Example 6.1 *Assume that type(q) =* **Boolean**. *Consider the program:*

$$S = \textbf{while } M[q] = 1 \textbf{ do } q := \sigma_z q$$

where $M_0 = |0\rangle\langle 0|$ and $M_1 = |1\rangle\langle 1|$. Let $P = |\psi\rangle_q\langle\psi| \otimes P'$, where $|\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2$, and $P' \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{q\}})$. Then

$$\models_{tot} \{P\}S\{|0\rangle_q\langle 0| \otimes P'\}$$

does not hold if $\beta \neq 0$ and $P \neq 0_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{q\}}}$. In fact, put

$$\rho = |\psi\rangle_q\langle\psi| \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{q\}}}.$$

Then

$$[|S|](\rho) = |\alpha|^2|0\rangle_q\langle 0| \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{q\}}}$$

and

$$tr(P\rho) = tr(P') > |\alpha|^2 tr(P') = tr((|0\rangle_q\langle 0| \otimes P')[|S|](\rho)).$$

On the other hand, we always have:

$$\models_{par} \{P\}S\{|0\rangle_q\langle 0| \otimes P'\}.$$

To show this, we first consider a special class of partial density operators on $\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{q\}}$: $\rho = |\varphi\rangle_q\langle\varphi| \otimes \rho'$, where $|\varphi\rangle = a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2$, and $\rho' \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{q\}})$. A routine calculation yields:

$$[|S|](\rho) = |a|^2|0\rangle_q\langle 0| \otimes \rho'$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} tr(P\rho) &= |\langle\psi|\varphi\rangle|^2 tr(P'\rho') \\ &\leq |a|^2 tr(P'\rho') + [tr(\rho') - |a|^2 tr(\rho')] \\ &= tr((|0\rangle_q\langle 0| \otimes P')[|S|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|S|](\rho))]. \end{aligned}$$

Then it follows from linearity of $[|S|]$ (Lemma 5.1) that

$$tr(P\rho) \leq tr((|0\rangle_q\langle 0| \otimes P')[|S|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|S|](\rho))]$$

for all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{all})$.

The following proposition presents some basic properties of correctness formulas.

Proposition 6.1 *1. If $\models_{tot} \{P\}S\{Q\}$, then $\models_{par} \{P\}S\{Q\}$.*

2. For any quantum program S, and for any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{\rm all})$, we have:

$$\models_{\rm tot} \{0_{\mathcal{H}_{\rm all}}\}S\{Q\}, \quad \models_{\rm par} \{P\}S\{I_{\mathcal{H}_{\rm all}}\}.$$

3. Linearity: For any $P_1, P_2, Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{\rm all})$ and $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \geq 0$ with $\lambda_1 P_1 + \lambda_2 P_2, \lambda_1 Q_1 + \lambda_2 Q_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{\rm all})$, if

$$\models_{tot} \{P_i\}S\{Q_i\} \ (i = 1, 2),$$

then

$$\models_{tot} \{\lambda_1 P_1 + \lambda_2 P_2\}S\{\lambda_1 Q_1 + \lambda_2 Q_2\}.$$

The same conclusion holds for partial correctness if $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 1$.

Proof. Immediate from definition. □

7 Weakest Preconditions and Weakest Liberal Preconditions

As in the case of classical Hoare logic, the notions of weakest precondition and weakest liberal precondition of quantum program will play a key role in establishing the (relative) completeness of Hoare logic for quantum programs. They may be defined in a familiar way:

Definition 7.1 *Let S be a quantum program and $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{\rm all})$ be a quantum predicate on $\mathcal{H}_{\rm all}$.*

1. *The weakest precondition of S with respect to P is defined to be the quantum predicate $wp.S.P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{\rm all})$ satisfying the following conditions:*

   (a) $\models_{\rm tot} \{wp.S.P\}S\{P\}$;

   (b) *if quantum predicate $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{all})$ satisfies $\models_{\rm tot} \{Q\}S\{P\}$ then $Q \sqsubseteq wp.S.P$.*

2. *The weakest liberal precondition of S with respect to P is defined to be the quantum predicate $wlp.S.P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{\rm all})$ satisfying the following conditions:*

   (a) $\models_{\rm par} \{wlp.S.P\}S\{P\}$;

   (b) *if quantum predicate $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{all})$ satisfies $\models_{\rm par} \{Q\}S\{P\}$ then $Q \sqsubseteq wlp.S.P$.*

The next two propositions give explicit representations of weakest preconditions and weakest liberal preconditions, respectively. They will be used in the proof of completeness of quantum Hoare logic.

Proposition 7.1 *1. (a)* $wp.\mathbf{skip}.P = P$.

(b) *If* $type(q) = \mathbf{Boolean}$, *then*

$$wp.q := 0.P = |0\rangle_q\langle 0|P|0\rangle_q\langle 0| + |1\rangle_q\langle 0|P|0\rangle_q\langle 1|,$$

and if $type(q) = \mathbf{integer}$, *then*

$$wp.q := 0.P = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |n\rangle_q\langle 0|P|0\rangle_q\langle n|.$$

(c) $wp.\overline{q} := U\overline{q}.P = U^\dagger PU$.

(d) $wp.S_1; S_2.P = wp.S_1.(wp.S_2.P)$.

(e) $wp.\mathbf{measure}\ M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}.P = \sum_m M_m^\dagger (wp.S_m.P) M_m$.

(f) $wp.\mathbf{while}\ M[\overline{q}] = 1\ \mathbf{do}\ S.P = \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} P_n$, *where*

$$\begin{cases} P_0 = 0_{\mathcal{H}_{all}}, \\ P_{n+1} = M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger (wp.S.P_n) M_1 \text{ for all } n \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

2. *For any quantum program S, for any quantum predicate $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{\rm all})$, and for any partial density operator $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{\rm all})$, we have:*

$$tr((wp.S.P)\rho) = tr(P[|S|]_{\rm par}(\rho)).$$

Proof. The trick is to simultaneously prove (1) and (2) by induction on the structure. This is indeed why we put these two conclusions that seem irrelevant at the first glance into a single proposition.

Case 1. $S = \mathbf{skip}$. Obvious.

Case 2. $S = q := 0$. We only consider the case of $type(q) = \mathbf{integer}$, and the case of $type(q) = \mathbf{Boolean}$ is similar. First, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} tr((\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |n\rangle_q\langle 0|P|0\rangle_q\langle n|)\rho) &= tr(P\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |0\rangle_q\langle n|\rho|n\rangle_q\langle 0|) \\ &= tr(P[|q := 0|](\rho)). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for any quantum predicate $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{all})$, if $\models_{\text{tot}} \{Q\}q := 0\{P\}$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} tr(Q\rho) &\leq tr(P[|q := 0|](\rho)) \\ &= tr((\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |n\rangle_q\langle 0|P|0\rangle_q\langle n|)\rho) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{\text{all}})$, then it follows from Lemma 2.1 that

$$Q \sqsubseteq \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |n\rangle_q\langle 0|P|0\rangle_q\langle n|.$$

Case 3. $S = \overline{q} := U\overline{q}$. Similar to Case 2.

Case 4. $S = S_1; S_2$. It follows from the induction hypothesis on S_1 and S_2 that

$$\begin{aligned} tr((wp.S_1.(wp.S_2.P))\rho) &= tr((wp.S_2.P)[|S_1|](\rho)) \\ &= tr(P[|S_2|]([|S_1|](\rho))) \\ &= tr(P[|S_1; S_2|](\rho)). \end{aligned}$$

If $\models_{\text{tot}} \{Q\}S_1; S_2\{P\}$, then for all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{\text{all}})$, we have:

$$tr(QP) \leq tr(P[|S_1; S_2|](\rho)) = tr((wp.S_1.(wp.S_2.P))\rho).$$

Therefore, it follows from Lemma 2.1 that $Q \sqsubseteq wp.S_1.(wp.S_2.P)$.

Case 5. $S = \mathbf{measure}\ M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}$. Applying the induction hypothesis on S_m, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} tr((\sum_m M_m^\dagger(wp.S_m.P)M_m)\rho) &= \sum_m tr((wp.S_m.P)M_m\rho M_m^\dagger) \\ &= \sum_m tr(P[|S_m|](M_m\rho M_m^\dagger)) \\ &= tr(P\sum_m [|S_m|](M_m\rho M_m^\dagger)) \\ &= tr(P[|\mathbf{measure}\ M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}|]_{\text{par}}(\rho)). \end{aligned}$$

If $\models_{\text{tot}} \{Q\}\textbf{measure } M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}\{P\}$, then

$$tr(Q\rho) \leq tr((\sum_m M_m^\dagger (wp.S_m.P) M_m)\rho)$$

for all ρ, and it follows from Lemma 2.1 that

$$Q \sqsubseteq \sum_m M_m^\dagger (wlp.S_m.P) M_m.$$

Case 6. $S = \textbf{while } M[\overline{q}] = 1 \textbf{ do } S'$. For simplicity, we write $(\textbf{while})^n$ for statement "$(\textbf{while } M[\overline{q}] = 1 \textbf{ do } S')^n$". First, we have:

$$tr(P_n\rho) = tr(P[|(\textbf{while})^n|](\rho)).$$

This claim can be proved by induction on n. The basis case of $n = 0$ is obvious. By the induction hypotheses on n and S', we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
tr(P_{n+1}\rho) &= tr(M_0^\dagger P M_0 \rho) + tr(M_1^\dagger (wp.S'.P_n) M_1 \rho) \\
&= tr(P M_0 \rho M_0^\dagger) + tr((wp.S'.P_n) M_1 \rho M_1^\dagger) \\
&= tr(P M_0 \rho M_0^\dagger) + tr(P_n[|S'|](M_1 \rho M_1^\dagger)) \\
&= tr(P M_0 \rho M_0^\dagger) + tr(P[|(\textbf{while})^n|]([|S'|]_{\text{par}}(M_1 \rho M_1^\dagger))) \\
&= tr[P(M_0 \rho M_0^\dagger + [|S'; (\textbf{while})^n|](M_1 \rho M_1^\dagger))] \\
&= tr(P[|(\textbf{while})^{n+1}|](\rho)).
\end{aligned}$$

Now continuity of trace operator yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
tr((\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} P_n)\rho) &= \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} tr(P_n\rho) \\
&= \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} tr(P[|(\textbf{while})^n|](\rho)) \\
&= tr(P \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} [|(\textbf{while})^n|](\rho)) \\
&= tr(P[|\textbf{while } M[\overline{q}] = 1 \textbf{ do } S'|](\rho)).
\end{aligned}$$

So, if

$$\models_{\text{tot}} \{Q\}\textbf{while } M[\overline{q}] = 1 \textbf{ do } S'\{P\},$$

then

$$tr(Q\rho) \leq tr((\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} P_n)\rho)$$

for all ρ, and by Lemma 2.1 we obtain $Q \sqsubseteq \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} P_n$. $\square$

Proposition 7.2 *1. (a)* $wlp.\mathbf{skip}.P = P$.

(b) If $type(q) = \mathbf{Boolean}$, *then*

$$wlp.q := 0.P = |0\rangle_q\langle 0|P|0\rangle_q\langle 0| + |1\rangle_q\langle 0|P|0\rangle_q\langle 1|,$$

and if $type(q) = \mathbf{integer}$, *then*

$$wlp.q := 0.P = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |n\rangle_q\langle 0|P|0\rangle_q\langle n|.$$

(c) $wlp.\overline{q} := U\overline{q}.P = U^\dagger PU$.

(d) $wlp.S_1; S_2.P = wlp.S_1.(wlp.S_2.P)$.

(e) $wlp.\mathbf{measure}\ M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}.P = \sum_m M_m^\dagger (wlp.S_m.P) M_m$.

(f) $wlp.\mathbf{while}\ M[\overline{q}] = 1\ \mathbf{do}\ S.P = \bigwedge_{n=0}^{\infty} P_n$, *where*

$$\begin{cases} P_0 = I_{\mathcal{H}_{all}}, \\ P_{n+1} = M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger (wlp.S.P_n) M_1 \text{ for all } n \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

2. For any quantum program S, *for any quantum predicate* $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{\rm all})$, *and for any partial density operator* $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{\rm all})$, *we have:*

$$tr((wlp.S.P)\rho) = tr(P[|S|]_{\rm par}(\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|S|](\rho)].$$

Proof. Similar to the case of weakest precondition, we prove (1) and (2) simultaneously by induction on the structure of quantum program S.

Case 1. $S = \mathbf{skip}$, or $q := 0$, or $\overline{q} := U\overline{q}$. Similar to Cases 1, 2 and 3 in the proof of Proposition 7.1.

Case 2. $S = S_1; S_2$. First, with the induction hypothesis on S_1 and S_2, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &tr(wlp.S_1.(wlp.S_2.P)\rho) = tr(wlp.S_2.P[|S_1|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|S_1|](\rho))] \\ &= tr(P[|S_2|]([|S_1|](\rho)) + [tr([|S_1|](\rho)) - tr([|S_2|]([|S_1|](\rho)))] + [tr(\rho) - tr([|S_1|](\rho))] \\ &= tr(P[|S_2|]([|S_1|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|S_2|]([|S_1|](\rho)))] \\ &= tr(P[|S|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|S|](\rho))]. \end{aligned}$$

If $\models_{\rm par} \{Q\}S\{P\}$, then it holds that

$$tr(Q\rho) \leq tr(P[|S|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|S|](\rho))] = tr(wlp.S_1.(wlp.S_2.P)\rho)$$

for all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{all})$, and by Lemma 2.1 we obtain:

$$Q \sqsubseteq wlp.S_1.(wlp.S_2.P).$$

Case 3. $S = \textbf{measure}\ M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}$. It can is derived by induction hypothesis on all S_m that

$$\begin{aligned}
&tr(\sum_m M_m^\dagger(wlp.S_m.P)M_m\rho) = \sum_m tr(M_m^\dagger(wlp.S_m.P)M_m\rho)\\
&= \sum_m tr((wlp.S_m.P)M_m\rho M_m^\dagger)\\
&= \sum_m \{tr(P[|S_m|](M_m\rho M_m^\dagger)) + [tr(M_m\rho M_m^\dagger) - tr([|S_m|](M_m\rho M_m^\dagger))]\}\\
&= \sum_m tr(P[|S_m|](M_m\rho M_m^\dagger)) + [\sum_m tr(M_m\rho M_m^\dagger) - \sum_m tr([|S_m|](M_m\rho M_m^\dagger))]\}\\
&= tr(P\sum_m [|S_m|](M_m\rho M_m^\dagger)) + [tr(\rho\sum_m M_m^\dagger M_m) - tr(\sum_m [|S_m|](M_m\rho M_m^\dagger))]\}\\
&= tr(P[|S|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|S|](\rho))]
\end{aligned}$$

because $\sum_m M_m^\dagger M_m = I_{\mathcal{H}_{\overline{q}}}$. If $\models_{\rm par} \{Q\}S\{P\}$, then for all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{all})$, it holds that

$$tr(Q\rho) \le tr(P[|S|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|S|](\rho))] = tr(\sum_m M_m^\dagger(wlp.S_m.P)M_m\rho).$$

This together with Lemma 2.1 implies

$$Q \sqsubseteq \sum_m M_m^\dagger(wlp.S_m.P)M_m.$$

Case 4. $S = \textbf{while}\ M[\overline{q}] = 1\ \textbf{do}\ S'$. We first prove that

$$tr(P_n\rho) = tr(P[|(\textbf{while})^n|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|(\textbf{while})^n|](\rho))] \tag{6}$$

by induction on n, where $(\textbf{while})^n$ is an abbreviation of $(\textbf{while}\ M[\overline{q}] = 1\ \textbf{do}\ S')^n$. The case of $n = 0$ is obvious. By induction on S' and induction hypothesis on n, we observe:

$$\begin{aligned}
&tr(P_{n+1}\rho) = tr[(M_0^\dagger P M_0) + M_1^\dagger(wlp.S'.P_n)M_1\rho]\\
&= tr(M_0^\dagger P M_0\rho) + tr(M_1^\dagger(wlp.S'.P_n)M_1\rho)\\
&= tr(PM_0\rho M_0^\dagger) + tr((wlp.S'.P_n)M_1\rho M_1^\dagger)\\
&= tr(PM_0\rho M_0^\dagger) + tr(P_n[|S'|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger)) + [tr(M_1\rho M_1^\dagger) - tr([|S'|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger))]\\
&= tr(PM_0\rho M_0^\dagger) + tr(P[|(\textbf{while})^n|]([|S|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger))) + [tr([|S|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger))\\
&\qquad - tr([|(\textbf{while})^n|]([|S|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger)))] + [tr(M_1\rho M_1^\dagger) - tr([|S'|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger))]\\
&= tr(P[M_0\rho M_0^\dagger + [|(\textbf{while})^n|]([|S|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger))]\\
&\qquad + [tr(\rho) - tr(M_0\rho M_0^\dagger + [|(\textbf{while})^n|]([|S|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger)))]\\
&= tr(P[|(\textbf{while})^{n+1}|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|(\textbf{while})^{n+1}|](\rho)].
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Eq. (6). Note that quantum predicate $P \sqsubseteq I$. Then $I - P$ is positive, and by continuity of trace operator we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
tr((\bigwedge_{n=0}^{\infty} P_n)\rho) &= \bigwedge_{n=0}^{\infty} tr(P_n\rho) \\
&= \bigwedge_{n=0}^{\infty} \{tr(P[|(\mathbf{while})^n|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|(\mathbf{while})^n|](\rho))]\} \\
&= tr(\rho) + \bigwedge_{n=0}^{\infty} tr[(P-I)[|(\mathbf{while})^n|](\rho)] \\
&= tr(\rho) + tr[(P-I)\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty}[|(\mathbf{while})^n|](\rho)] \\
&= tr(\rho) + tr[(P-I)[|S|](\rho)] \\
&= tr(P[|S|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|S|](\rho))].
\end{aligned}$$

For any $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{all})$, $\models_{\text{par}} \{Q\}S\{P\}$ implies:

$$tr(Q\rho) \leq tr(P[|S|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|S|](\rho)) = tr((\bigwedge_{n=0}^{\infty} P_n)\rho)$$

for all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{all})$. This together with Lemma 2.1 leads to $Q \sqsubseteq \bigwedge_{n=0}^{\infty} P_n$. $\square$

We see that Propositions 7.1 and 7.2 coincide with Figs. 2 and 3, respectively, in [11] when only quantum variables of type **Boolean** are considered. But Figs. 2 and 3 in [11] are given directly as definitions, and their intuitive meanings are not clear because they do not have any connection to total and partial correctness of quantum programs. In contrast, Propositions 7.1 and 7.2 fill in such a gap, and they are derived from Definition 7.1, which is given entirely based on the notions of total and partial correctness of quantum programs.

The next proposition gives a recursive characterization of weakest precondition and weakest liberal precondition of quantum loop, and it provides a key step in the proof of completeness of quantum Hoare logic.

Proposition 7.3 *We write* **while** *for quantum loop "***while** $M[\overline{q}] = 1$ **do** S*". Then for any* $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{all})$*, we have:*

1. $wp.\mathbf{while}.P = M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger (wp.S.(wp.\mathbf{while}.P))M_1$.
2. $wlp.\mathbf{while}.P = M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger (wlp.S.(wlp.\mathbf{while}.P))M_1$.

Proof. We only prove (2), and the proof of (1) is similar and easier. For every $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^{-}(\mathcal{H}_{all})$, by Proposition 7.2(2) we observe:

$$\begin{aligned}
&tr[(M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger (wlp.S.(wlp.\mathbf{while}.P))M_1)\rho] \\
&= tr(PM_0\rho M_0^\dagger) + tr[(wlp.S.(wlp.\mathbf{while}.P))M_1\rho M_1^\dagger] \\
&= tr(PM_0\rho M_0^\dagger) + tr[(wlp.\mathbf{while}.P)[|S|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger)] \\
&\qquad\qquad + [tr(M_1\rho M_1^\dagger) - tr([|S|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger))] \\
&= tr(PM_0\rho M_0^\dagger) + tr[P[|\mathbf{while}|]([|S|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger))] + [tr([|S|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger) \\
&\qquad - tr([|\mathbf{while}|]([|S|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger))] + [tr(M_1\rho M_1^\dagger) - tr([|S|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger))] \\
&= tr[P(M_0\rho M_0^\dagger + [|\mathbf{while}|]([|S|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger)))] \\
&\qquad\qquad + [tr(M_1\rho M_1^\dagger) - tr([|\mathbf{while}|]([|S|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger))] \\
&= tr(P[|\mathbf{while}|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho M_1^\dagger M_1) - tr([|\mathbf{while}|]([|S|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger)))] \\
&= tr(P[|\mathbf{while}|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho(I - M_0^\dagger M_0)) - tr([|\mathbf{while}|]([|S|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger)))] \\
&= tr(P[|\mathbf{while}|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr(M_0\rho M_0^\dagger + [|\mathbf{while}|]([|S|](M_1\rho M_1^\dagger)))] \\
&= tr(P[|\mathbf{while}|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|\mathbf{while}|](\rho))].
\end{aligned}$$

This means that

$$\{M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger (wlp.S.(wlp.\mathbf{while}.P))M_1\}\mathbf{while}\{P\},$$

and

$$Q \sqsubseteq M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger (wlp.S.(wlp.\mathbf{while}.P))M_1$$

provided $\models_{\text{par}} \{Q\}\mathbf{while}\{P\}$. $\square$

8 Proof System for Partial Correctness

Now we are ready to present an axiomatic system of Hoare logic for quantum programs. The quantum Hoare logic can be divided into two proof systems, one for partial correctness and one for total correctness. In this section, we introduce the proof system qPD for partial correctness of quantum programs. It consists of the axioms and inference rules in Fig. 2.

We first prove the soundness of the proof system qPD with respect to the semantics of partial correctness: provability of a correctness formula in qPD implies its truth in the sense of partial correctness.

Theorem 8.1 *(Soundness) The proof system qPD is sound for partial correctness of quantum programs; that is, for any quantum program S and quantum predicates $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{all}})$, we have:*

$$\vdash_{qPD} \{P\}S\{Q\} \text{ implies } \models_{\text{par}} \{P\}S\{Q\}.$$

Proof. We only need to show that the axioms and inference rules of qPD are valid in the sense of partial correctness.

(Axiom Skip) It is obvious that $\models_{\text{par}} \{P\}\mathbf{skip}\{P\}$.

(Axiom Initialization) We only prove the case of $type(q) = \mathbf{integer}$, and the case of $type(q) = \mathbf{Boolean}$ is similar. For any $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^{-}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{all}})$, it follows from Proposition 5.1.2 that

$$\begin{aligned} tr[(\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |n\rangle_q\langle 0|P|0\rangle_q\langle n|)\rho] &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} tr(|n\rangle_q\langle 0|P|0\rangle_q\langle n|\rho) \\ &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} tr(P|0\rangle_q\langle n|\rho|n\rangle_q\langle 0|) \\ &= tr(P\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |0\rangle_q\langle n|\rho|n\rangle_q\langle 0|) \\ &= tr(P[|q := 0|](\rho)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have:

$$\models_{\text{par}} \{\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |n\rangle_q\langle 0|P|0\rangle_q\langle n|\}q := 0\{P\}.$$

(Axiom Unitary Transformation) It is easy to see that

$$\models_{\text{par}} \{U^{\dagger}PU\}\overline{q} := U\overline{q}\{P\}.$$

(Rule Sequential Composition) If $\models_{\text{par}} \{P\}S_1\{Q\}$ and $\models_{\text{par}} \{Q\}S_2\{R\}$, then for any $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^{-}(\mathcal{H}_{all})$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} tr(P\rho) &\leq tr(Q[|S_1|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|S_1|](\rho))] \\ &\leq tr(R[|S_2|]([|S_1|](\rho))) + [tr([|S_1|](\rho)) - tr([|S_2|]([|S_1|](\rho)))] \\ &\qquad + [tr(\rho) - tr([|S_1|](\rho))] \\ &= tr(R[|S_1; S_2|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|S_1; S_2|](\rho))]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\models_{\text{par}} \{P\}S_1; S_2\{R\}$ as desired.

(Rule Measurement) Assume that $\models_{par} \{P_m\}S_m\{Q\}$ for all m. Then for all

$\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{all})$, since $\sum_m M_m^\dagger M_m = I_{\mathcal{H}_{\overline{q}}}$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
&tr(\sum_m M_m^\dagger P_m M_m \rho) = \sum_m tr(M_m^\dagger P_m M_m \rho) \\
&= \sum_m tr(P_m M_m \rho M_m^\dagger) \\
&\leq \sum_m \{tr(Q[|S_m|](M_m \rho M_m^\dagger)) + [tr(M_m \rho M_m^\dagger) - tr([|S_m|](M_m \rho M_m^\dagger))]\} \\
&\leq \sum_m tr(Q[|S_m|](M_m \rho M_m^\dagger)) + [\sum_m tr(M_m \rho M_m^\dagger) - \sum_m tr([|S_m|](M_m \rho M_m^\dagger))]\} \\
&= tr(Q \sum_m [|S_m|](M_m \rho M_m^\dagger)) + [tr(\sum_m \rho M_m^\dagger M_m) - tr(\sum_m [|S_m|](M_m \rho M_m^\dagger))]\} \\
&= tr(Q[|\mathbf{measure}|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|\mathbf{measure}|](\rho)],
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\models_{\text{par}} \{\sum_m M_m^\dagger P_m M_m\} \mathbf{measure} \{Q\},$$

where **measure** is an abbreviation of statement "**measure** $M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}$".

(Rule Loop Partial) Suppose that

$$\models_{\text{par}} \{Q\} S \{M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger Q M_1.$$

Then for all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{all})$, it holds that

$$tr(Q\rho) \leq tr((M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger Q M_1)[|S|](\rho)) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|S|](\rho))]. \tag{7}$$

Furthermore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
tr[(M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger Q M_1)\rho] \leq &\sum_{k=0}^{n} tr(P(\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k)(\rho)) \\
&+ tr(Q(\mathcal{E}_1 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n)(\rho)) \\
&+ \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} [tr(\mathcal{E}_1 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k(\rho)) - tr(([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^{k+1}(\rho))]
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

for all $n \geq 1$. In fact, Eq. (8) may be proved by induction on n. The case of $n = 1$ is obvious. Using Eq. (7), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
&tr(Q(\mathcal{E}_1 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n)(\rho)) \leq tr((M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger Q M_1)([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^{n+1}(\rho)) \\
&\qquad + [tr((\mathcal{E}_1 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n)(\rho)) - tr(([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^{n+1}(\rho))] \\
&= tr(P(\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^{n+1})(\rho)) + tr(Q(\mathcal{E}_1 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^{n+1})(\rho)) \\
&\quad + [tr((\mathcal{E}_1 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n)(\rho)) - tr(([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^{n+1}(\rho))].
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Combining Eqs. (8) and (9), we assert that

$$\begin{aligned} tr[(M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger Q M_1)\rho] \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n+1} & tr(P(\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k)(\rho)) \\ & + tr(Q(\mathcal{E}_1 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^{n+1})(\rho)) \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^{n} [tr(\mathcal{E}_1 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k(\rho)) - tr(([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^{k+1}(\rho))]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Eq. (8) holds in the case of $n+1$ provided it is true in the case of n, and we complete the proof of Eq. (8).

Now we note that

$$\begin{aligned} tr((\mathcal{E}_1 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k(\rho)) &= tr(M_1([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k(\rho) M_1^\dagger) \\ &= tr(([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k(\rho) M_1^\dagger M_1) \\ &= tr(([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k(\rho)(I - M_0^\dagger M_0)) \\ &= tr(([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k(\rho)) - tr((\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k)(\rho)). \end{aligned}$$

Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} [tr(\mathcal{E}_1 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k(\rho)) - tr(([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^{k+1}(\rho))] &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} tr(([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k(\rho)) \\ - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} [tr(\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k(\rho)) &- \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} tr(([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^{k+1}(\rho)) \qquad (10) \\ = tr(\rho) - tr(([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n(\rho)) &- \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} tr(\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k(\rho)). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} tr(Q(\mathcal{E}_1 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n)(\rho)) &= tr(Q M_1([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n)(\rho) M_1^\dagger) \\ &\leq tr(M_1([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n)(\rho) M_1^\dagger) \\ &= tr(([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n)(\rho) M_1^\dagger M_1) \qquad (11) \\ &= tr(([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n)(\rho)(I - M_0^\dagger M_0)) \\ &= tr(([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n)(\rho)) - tr((\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n)(\rho)). \end{aligned}$$

Putting Eqs. (10) and (11) into Eq. (8), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} tr[(M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger Q M_1)\rho] &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{n} tr(P(\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k)(\rho)) \\ &\quad + [tr(\rho) - \sum_{k=0}^{n} tr((\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k)(\rho))] \\ &= tr(P \sum_{k=0}^{n} (\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k)(\rho)) \\ &\quad + [tr(\rho) - tr(\sum_{k=0}^{n} (\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k)(\rho))]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $n \to \infty$. Then it follows that

$$tr[(M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger Q M_1)\rho] \leq tr(P[|\mathbf{while}|](\rho) + [tr(\rho) - tr([|\mathbf{while}|](\rho))]$$

and

$$\models_{\text{par}} \{M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger Q M_1\}\mathbf{while}\{P\},$$

where **while** is an abbreviation of quantum loop "**while** $M[\overline{q}] = 1$ **do** S". □

Now we are going to establish completeness for the proof system qPD with respect to the semantics of partial correctness: truth of a quantum program in the sense of partial correctness implies its provability in qPD. Note that the Löwner ordering assertions between quantum predicates in (Rule Order) are statements about complex numbers. So, only a completeness of qPD relative to the theory of the field of complex numbers may be anticipated; more precisely, we can add all statements that are true in the field of complex numbers into qPD in order to make it complete. The following theorem should be understood exactly in the sense of such a relative completeness.

Theorem 8.2 *(Completeness) The proof system qPD is complete for partial correctness of quantum programs; that is, for any quantum program S and quantum predicates $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{all}})$, we have:*

$$\models_{\text{par}} \{P\}S\{Q\} \text{ implies } \vdash_{qPD} \{P\}S\{Q\}.$$

Proof. If $\models_{\text{par}} \{P\}S\{Q\}$, then by Definition 7.1 (2) we have $P \sqsubseteq wlp.S.Q$. Therefore, by (Rule Order) it suffices to prove the following:

- Claim: $\vdash_{qPD} \{wlp.S.Q\}S\{Q\}$.

We proceed by induction on the structure of S.

Case 1. $S = \mathbf{skip}$. Immediate from (Axiom Skip).

Case 2. $S = q := 0$. Immediate from (Axiom Initialization).

Case 3. $S = \overline{q} := U\overline{q}$. Immediate from (Axiom Unitary Transformation).

Case 4. $S = S_1; S_2$. It follows from the induction hypothesis on S_1 and S_2 that

$$\vdash_{qPD} \{wlp.S_1.(wlp.S_2.Q)\}S_1\{wlp.S_2.Q\}$$

and

$$\vdash_{qPD} \{wlp.S_2.Q\}S_2\{Q\}.$$

We obtain:

$$\vdash_{qPD} \{wlp.S_1.(wlp.S_2.Q)\}S_1; S_2\{Q\}$$

by (Rule Sequential Composition). Then with Proposition 7.2 (1.d) we see that

$$\vdash_{qPD} \{wlp.S_1; S_2.Q\}S_1; S_2\{Q\}.$$

Case 5. $S = \textbf{measure}\ M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}$. For all m, by the induction hypothesis on S_m we obtain:

$$\vdash_{qPD} \{wlp.S_m.Q\}S_m\{Q\}.$$

Then applying (Rule Measurement) yields:

$$\vdash_{qPD} \{\sum_m M_m^\dagger(wlp.S_m.Q)M_m\}\textbf{measure}\ M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}\{Q\},$$

and using Proposition 7.2 (1.e) we have:

$$\vdash_{qPD} \{wlp.\textbf{measure}\ M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}.P\}\textbf{measure}\ M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}\{Q\}.$$

Case 6. $S = \textbf{while}\ M[\overline{q}] = 1\ \textbf{do}\ S'$. For simplicity, we write **while** for quantum loop "**while** $M[\overline{q}] = 1$ **do** S'". The induction hypothesis on S asserts that

$$\vdash_{qPD} \{wlp.S.(wlp.\textbf{while}.P)\}S\{wlp.\textbf{while}.P\}.$$

By Proposition 7.3(2) we have:

$$wlp.\textbf{while}.P = M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger(wlp.S.(wlp.\textbf{while}.P))M_1.$$

Then by (Rule Loop Par) we obtain:

$$\vdash_{qPD} \{wlp.\textbf{while}.P\}\textbf{while}\{P\}$$

as desired. □

9 Proof System for Total Correctness

The aim of this section is to present a proof system qTD for correctness of quantum program. The only difference between qTD and qPD is the inference rule for quantum loops. To give the rule for total correctness of quantum loops, we need a notion of bound function which express the number of iterations of a quantum loop in its computation.

Definition 9.1 *Let $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{\rm all})$ and $\epsilon > 0$. A function $t : \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{\rm all}) \to \mathbb{N}$ is called a $(P, \epsilon)-$bound function of quantum loop "***while** $M[\overline{q}] = 1$ **do** S*"if it satisfies the following conditions:*

1. $t([|S|](M_1 \rho M_1^\dagger)) \leq t(\rho)$*; and*
2. $tr(P\rho) \geq \epsilon$ *implies* $t([|S|](M_1 \rho M_1^\dagger)) < t(\rho)$

for all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{\rm all})$.

Recall that a bound function t of a classical loop "**while** B **do** S **od** "satisfies the inequality $t([|S|](s)) < t(s)$ for any input state s. It is interesting to compare it with conditions (1) and (2) of the above definition, and we see that the latter are two inequalities between $t([|S|](M_1 \rho M_1^\dagger))$ and $t(\rho)$ but not between $t([|S|](\rho))$ and $t(\rho)$. This is because in the implementation of the quantum loop "**while** $M[\overline{q}] = 1$ **do** S", we need to perform the yes-no measurement M on ρ when checking the loop guard "$M[\overline{q}] = 1$", and the state of quantum variables will become $M_1 \rho M_1^\dagger$ from ρ whence the measurement outcome "yes"is observed.

The following lemma gives a characterization of the existence of bound function of a quantum loop in terms of the limit of the state of quantum variables when the number of iterations of the loop goes to infinity. It provides a key step for the proof of soundness and completeness of the proof system qTD.

Lemma 9.1 *Let $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{\rm all})$. Then the following two statements are equivalent:*

1. *for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $(P, \epsilon)-$bound function t_ϵ of quantum loop "***while** $M[\overline{q}] = 1$ **do** S*";*
2. $\lim_{n\to\infty} tr(P([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n(\rho)) = 0$ *for all $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{\rm all})$.*

Proof. $(1 \Rightarrow 2)$ We prove this by refutation. If

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} tr(P([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n(\rho)) \neq 0,$$

then there exist $\epsilon_0 > 0$ and strictly increasing sequence $\{n_k\}$ of nonnegative integers such that

$$tr(P([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^{n_k}(\rho)) \geq \epsilon_0$$

for all $k \geq 0$. Thus, we have a $(P, \epsilon_0)-$bound function of loop **while** $M[\overline{q}] = 1$ **do** S. For each $k \geq 0$, we set

$$\rho_k = ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^{n_k}(\rho).$$

Then it holds that $tr(P\rho_k) \geq \epsilon_0$, and by conditions 1 and 2 in Definition 9.1 we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} tt_{\epsilon_0}(\rho_k) &> t_{\epsilon_0}([|S|](M_1 \rho_k M_1^\dagger)) \\ &= t_{\epsilon_0}(([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)(\rho_k)) \\ &\geq t_{\epsilon_0}(([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^{n_{k+1}-n_k}(\rho_k)) \\ &= t_{\epsilon_0}(\rho_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have an infinitely descending chain $\{t_{\epsilon_0}(\rho_k)\}$ in $\mathbb{N}$, the set of non-negative integers. This is a contradiction because $\mathbb{N}$ is a well-founded set.

$(2 \Rightarrow 1)$ For each $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{\text{all}})$, if

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} tr(P([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n(\rho)) = 0,$$

then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$tr(P([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n(\rho)) < \epsilon$$

for all $n \geq N$. We define:

$$t_\epsilon(\rho) = \min\{N \in \mathbb{N} : tr(P([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n(\rho)) < \epsilon \text{ for all } n \geq N\}.$$

Now it suffices to show that t_ϵ is a $(P, \epsilon)-$bound function of loop "**while** $M[\overline{q}] = 1$ **do** S". To this end. we consider the following two cases:

Case 1. $tr(P\rho) \geq \epsilon$. Suppose that $t_\epsilon(\rho) = N$. Then $tr(P\rho) \geq \epsilon$ implies $N \geq 1$. By the definition of t_ϵ, we assert that

$$tr(P([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n(\rho)) < \epsilon$$

for all $n \geq N$. Thus, for all $n \geq N - 1 \geq 0$,

$$tr(P([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n([|S|](M_1^\dagger \rho M_1))) = tr(P([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^{n+1}(\rho)) < \epsilon.$$

Therefore,

$$t_\epsilon([|S|](M_1^\dagger \rho M_1)) \leq N - 1 < N = t_\epsilon(\rho).$$

Case 2. $tr(P\rho) < \epsilon$. Again, suppose that $t_\epsilon(\rho) = N$. Now we have the following two subcases:

Subcase 2.1. $N = 0$. Then for all $n \geq 0$,

$$tr(P([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n(\rho)) < \epsilon.$$

It is easy to see that $t_\epsilon([|S|](M_1 \rho M_1^\dagger)) = 0 = t_\epsilon(\rho)$.

Subcase 2.2. $n \geq 1$. We can derive that

$$t_\epsilon(\rho) > t_\epsilon([|S|](M_1 \rho M_1^\dagger))$$

in the way of Case 1. $\square$

Now we are ready to present the proof system qTD for total correctness of quantum programs. It consists of the axioms (Axiom Skip), (Axiom Initialization) and (Axiom Unitary Transformation) and inference rules (Rule Sequential Composition), (Rule Measurement) and (Rule Order) in Fig.2 as well as inference rule (Rule Loop Total) in Fig.3.

The remainder of this section will be devoted to establish soundness and completeness of qTD: provability of a correctness formula in qTD is equivalent to its truth in the sense of total correctness.

Theorem 9.1 *(Soundness) The proof system TD is sound for total correctness of quantum programs; that is, for any quantum program S and quantum predicates $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{\text{all}})$, we have:*

$$\vdash_{qTD} \{P\}S\{Q\} \text{ implies } \models_{\text{tot}} \{P\}S\{Q\}.$$

Proof. It suffices to show that the axioms and inference rules of TD are valid in the sense of total correctness.

The proof for soundness of (Axiom Skip), (Axiom Initialization) and (Axiom Unitary Transformation) is similar to the case of partial correctness.

(Rule Sequential Composition) Suppose that $\models_{\text{tot}} \{P\}S_1\{Q\}$ and $\models_{\text{tot}} \{Q\}S_2\{R\}$. Then for any $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{\text{all}})$, with Proposition 5.1.4 we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} tr(P\rho) &\leq tr(Q[|S_1|](\rho)) \\ &\leq tr(R[|S_2|]([|S_1|](\rho))) \\ &= tr(P[|S_1; S_2|](\rho)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\models_{\text{tot}} \{P\}S_1; S_2\{R\}$.

(Rule Measurement) Suppose that $\models_{\text{tot}} \{P_m\}S_m\{Q\}$ for all m. Then for any $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{\text{all}})$, it holds that

$$tr(P_m M_m \rho M_m^\dagger) \leq tr(Q[|S_m|](M_m \rho M_m^\dagger))$$

because $\{P_m\}S_m\{Q\}$ for all m. Therefore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} tr(\sum_m M_m^\dagger P_m M_m \rho) &= \sum_m tr(P_m M_m \rho M_m^\dagger) \\ &\leq \sum_m tr(Q[|S_m|](M_m \rho M_m^\dagger)) \\ &= tr(Q \sum_m [|S_m|](M_m \rho M_m^\dagger)) \\ &= tr(Q[|\textbf{measure } M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}|](\rho)), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\models_{\text{tot}} \{\sum_m M_m^\dagger P M_m\}\textbf{measure } M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}\{Q\}.$$

(Rule Loop Total) If

$$\models_{\text{tot}} \{Q\}S\{M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger Q M_1\},$$

then for any $\rho \in \mathcal{D}^-(\mathcal{H}_{\text{all}})$, we have:

$$tr(Q\rho) \leq tr((M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger Q M_1)[|S|]_{\text{par}}(\rho)). \tag{12}$$

We first prove the following inequality:

$$tr[(M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger Q M_1)\rho] \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n} tr(P[\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)]^k(\rho)) + tr(Q[\mathcal{E}_1 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n](\rho)) \quad (13)$$

by induction on n. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} tr[(M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger Q M_1)\rho] &= tr(P M_0 \rho M_0^\dagger) + tr(Q M_1 \rho M_1^\dagger) \\ &= tr(P\mathcal{E}_0(\rho)) + tr(Q\mathcal{E}_1(\rho)). \end{aligned}$$

So, Eq. (13) is correct for the base case of $n = 0$. Assume Eq. (13) is correct for the case of $n = m$. Then applying Eq. (12), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} &tr[(M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger Q M_1)\rho] = tr(P\mathcal{E}_0(\rho)) + tr(Q M_1 \rho M_1^\dagger) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{m} tr(P[\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)]^k(\rho)) + tr(Q[\mathcal{E}_1 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^m](\rho)) \\ &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{m} tr(P[\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)]^k(\rho)) + tr((M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger Q M_1)[|S|]([\mathcal{E}_1 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^m](\rho))) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{m} tr(P[\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)]^k(\rho)) + tr(P M_0[|S|]([\mathcal{E}_1 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^m](\rho)) M_0^\dagger) \\ &\qquad + tr(Q M_1[|S|]([\mathcal{E}_1 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^m](\rho)) M_1^\dagger) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{m+1} tr(P[\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)]^k(\rho)) + tr(Q[\mathcal{E}_1 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^{m+1}](\rho)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Eq. (13) also holds for the case of $n = M + 1$. Now, since for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $M_1^\dagger Q M_1, \epsilon-$bound function t_ϵ of quantum loop "**while** $M[\overline{q}] = 1$ **do** S", by Lemma 9.1 we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n\to\infty} tr(Q[\mathcal{E}_1 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n(\rho)) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} tr(Q M_1([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n(\rho) M_1^\dagger) \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} tr(M_1^\dagger Q M_1([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n(\rho)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} tr[(M_0^\dagger P M_0 + M_1^\dagger Q M_1)\rho] &\leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{n} tr(P[\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)]^n(\rho)) \\ &\qquad + \lim_{n\to\infty} tr(Q[\mathcal{E}_1 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n](\rho)) \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} tr(P[\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)]^n(\rho)) \\ &= tr(P \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} [\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n](\rho)) \\ &= tr(P[|\textbf{while } M[\overline{q}] = 1 \textbf{ do } S|](\rho)). \ \square \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 9.2 *(Completeness) The proof system TD is complete for total correctness of quantum programs; that is, for any quantum program S and quantum predicates $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{\rm all})$, we have:*

$$\models_{\rm tot} \{P\}S\{Q\} \text{ implies } \vdash_{qTD} \{P\}S\{Q\}.$$

Proof. Similar to the case of partial correctness, it suffices to prove the following:

- Claim: $\vdash_{qTD} \{wlp.S.Q\}S\{Q\}$ for any quantum program S and quantum predicate $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_{\rm all})$

because by Definition 7.1 (1) we have $P \sqsubseteq wp.S.Q$ when $\models_{tot} \{P\}S\{Q\}$. The above claim can be done by induction on the structure of S. We only consider the case of $S =$ **while** $M[\overline{q}] = 1$ **do** S', and the other cases are similar to the proof of Theorem 8.2. We write **while** for quantum loop "**while** $M[\overline{q}] = 1$ **do** S'". It follows from Proposition 7.3(1) that

$$wp.\mathbf{while}.Q = M_0^\dagger Q M_0 + M_1^\dagger (wp.S.(wp.\mathbf{while}.Q))M_1.$$

So, our aim is to derive that

$$\vdash_{qTD} \{M_0^\dagger Q M_0 + M_1^\dagger (wp.S.(wp.\mathbf{while}.Q))M_1\}\mathbf{while}\{Q\}.$$

By the induction hypothesis on S' we get:

$$\vdash_{qTD} \{wp.S'.(wp.\mathbf{while}.Q)\}S\{wp.\mathbf{while}.Q\}.$$

Then by (Rule Loop Total) it suffices to show that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $(M_1^\dagger(wp.S'.\ (wp.S.Q))M_1, \epsilon)-$bound function of quantum loop **while**. Applying Lemma 9.1, we only need to prove:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} tr(M_1^\dagger(wp.S'.(wp.\mathbf{while}.Q))M_1([|S'|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n(\rho)) = 0. \tag{14}$$

First, by Propositions 7.1 (2) and 5.1 (6) we observe:

$$\begin{aligned} &tr(M_1^\dagger(wp.S'.(wp.\mathbf{while}.Q))M_1([|S'|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n(\rho)) \\ &\quad = tr(wp.S'.(wp.\mathbf{while}.Q)M_1([|S'|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n(\rho)M_1^\dagger) \\ &\quad = tr(wp.\mathbf{while}.Q[|S'|](M_1([|S'|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^n(\rho)M_1^\dagger)) \\ &\quad = tr(wp.\mathbf{while}.Q([|S'|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^{n+1}(\rho)) \\ &\quad = tr(Q[|\mathbf{while}|]([|S'|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^{n+1}(\rho)) \\ &\quad = \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} tr(Q[\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S'|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k](\rho)). \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Second, we consider the following infinite series of nonnegative real numbers:

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} tr(Q[\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S'|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k](\rho)) = tr(Q\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}[\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S'|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k](\rho)). \tag{16}$$

Since $Q \sqsubseteq I_{\mathcal{H}_{all}}$, it follows from Propositions 5.1 (6) and 5.2 that

$$tr(Q\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}[\mathcal{E}_0 \circ ([|S'|] \circ \mathcal{E}_1)^k](\rho)) = tr(Q[|\mathbf{while}|](\rho)) \\ \leq tr([|\mathbf{while}|](\rho)) \leq tr(\rho) \leq 1.$$

Therefore, the infinite series Eq. (16) converges. Note that Eq. (15) is the sum of the remaining terms of the infinite series Eq. (16) after the nth term. Then convergence of the infinite series Eq. (16) implies Eq. (14), and we complete the proof. □

It should be pointed out that the above theorem is merely a relative completeness of qTD with respect to the theory of the fields of complex numbers because except that (Rule Order) is employed in qTD, the existence of bound functions in (Rule Loop Total) is also a statement about complex numbers.

10 Conclusion

Based on D'Hondt and Panangaden's idea of representing quantum predicates by Hermitian operators and Selinger's idea of modeling quantum programs by super-operators, a full-fledged Hoare logic is developed for deterministic quantum programs, and its completeness relative to the theory of the field of complex numbers is proved in this paper.

An interesting problem for further studies is to find reasonable extensions of the quantum Hoare logic presented in this paper for bigger classes of quantum programs, including nondeterministic quantum programs [25], parallel and distributed quantum programs. Hopefully, they will serve as a logical foundation of various effective techniques for verification of these bigger classes of quantum programs.

References

[1] D. Akatov, *The Logic of Quantum Program Verification*, Master Thesis, Oxford University Computing Laboratory, 2005.

[2] T. Altenkirch and J. Grattage, A functional quantum programming language, in: *Proceedings of the 20th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, 2005, pp. 249-258.

[3] K. R. Apt and E. R. Olderog, *Verification of Sequential and Concurrent Programs,* Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997.

[4] A. Baltag and S. Smets, The logic of quantum programs, in: P. Selinger (ed.), *Proceedinds of QPL'2004*, TUCS General Publication 33, Turku Center for Computer Science, pp. 39-56.

[5] A. Baltag and S. Smets, LQP: the dynamic logic of quantum information, *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 16(2006)491-525.

[6] S. Bettelli, T. Calarco and L. Serafini, Toward an architecture for quantum programming, *The European Physical Journal D*, 25(2003)181-200.

[7] G. Birkhoff and J. von Neumann, The logic of quantum mechanics, *Annals of Mathematics*, 37(1936)823-843.

[8] O. Brunet and P. Jorrand, Dynamic quantum logic for quantum programs, *International Journal of Quantum Information*, 2(2004)45-54.

[9] R. Chadha, P. Mateus and A. Sernadas, Reasoning about imperative quantum programs, *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, 158(2006)19-39.

[10] E. D'Hondt and P. Panangaden, Quantum weakest preconditions, *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 16(2006)429-451.

[11] Y. Feng, R. Y. Duan, Z. F. Ji and M. S. Ying, Proof rules for the correctness of quantum programs, *Theoretical Computer Science*, 386(2007)151-166.

[12] S. Gay, Quantum programming languages: survey and bibliography, *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 16(2006)581-600.

[13] E. H. Knill, *Conventions for quantum pseudocode*, Technical Report LAUR-96-2724, Los Alamos National Laboratory, 1996.

[14] C. Morgan, *Proof rules for probabilistic loops*, Technical Report PRG-TR-25-95, Programming Research Group, Oxford University, 1995.

[15] S. -C. Mu and R. Bird, Functional quantum programming, in: *Proceedings of the 2nd Asian Workshop on Programming Languages and Systems*, 2001.

[16] B. Ömer, *Structural quantum programming*, Ph.D. Thesis, Technical University of Vienna, 2003.

[17] A. Petersen and M. Oskin, A new algebraic foundation for quantum programming languages, in: *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Non-Silicon Computing*, 2003.

[18] J. W. Sanders and P. Zuliani, Quantum programming, in: *Proceedings, Mathematics of Program Construction*, LNCS 1837, Springer-Verlag, 2000, pp. 88-99.

[19] P. Selinger, Towards a quantum programming language, *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 14(2004)527-586.

[20] P. Selinger, A brief survey of quantum programming languages, in: *Proceedings of the 7th International Symposium on Functional and Logic Programming*, LNCS 2998, Springer-Verlag, 2004.

[21] J. von Neumann, On infinite direct products, *Compos. Math.*, 6(1938)1-77.

[22] M. S. Ying, J. X. Chen, Y. Feng and R. Y. Duan, Commutativity of quantum weakest preconditions, *Information Processing Letters*, 104(2007)152-158.

[23] M. S. Ying, R. Y. Duan, Y. Feng and Z. F. Ji, Predicate transformer semantics of quantum programs, in: I. Mackie and S. Gay (eds.), *Semantic Techniques in Quantum Computation*, Cambridge University Press, 2009.

[24] M. S. Ying and Y. Feng, Quantum loop programs, *Acta Informatica* (under review).

[25] P. Zuliani, Nondeterministic quantum programming, in: P. Selinger (ed.), *Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on Quantum Programming Languages, July 12-13, 2004, Turku, Finland*, TUCS General Publication No. 33, Turku Center for Computer Science, pp. 179-195.

[26] P. Zuliani, Compiling quantum programs, *Acta Informatica*, 41(2005)435-474.

Appendix: Proof of Proposition 5.3

(1) We proceed by induction on the structure of S.

Case 1. $S = \textbf{skip}$. Obvious.

Case 2. $S = q := 0$. We only consider the case of $type(q) = \textbf{integer}$, and the case of $type(q) = \textbf{Boolean}$ is similar. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} tr_{var(S)}([|S|](\rho)) &= \sum_{n,n'=-\infty}^{\infty} {}_q\langle n'|0\rangle_q \langle n|\rho|n\rangle_q \langle 0|n'\rangle_q \\ &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} {}_q\langle n|\rho|n\rangle_q \\ &= tr_{var(S)}(\rho). \end{aligned}$$

Case 3. $S = \overline{q} := U\overline{q}$. If $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}_{\overline{q}}$, then $\{U^\dagger|\psi_i\rangle\}$ is also an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}_{\overline{q}}$. Consequently,

$$tr_{Var(S)}([|S|](\rho)) = \sum_i \langle\psi_i|U\rho U^\dagger|\psi_i\rangle = tr_{Var(S)}(\rho).$$

Case 4. $S = S_1; S_2$. By the induction hypothesis on S_1 and S_2, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} tr_{var(S)}([|S|](\rho)) &= tr_{var(S_1)\cup var(S_2)}([|S_2|]([|S_1|](\rho))) \\ &= tr_{var(S_1)}(tr_{var(S_2)}([|S_2|]([|S_1|](\rho)))) \\ &= tr_{var(S_1)}(tr_{var(S_2)}([|S_1|](\rho))) \\ &= tr_{var(S_2)}(tr_{var(S_1)}([|S_1|](\rho))) \\ &= tr_{var(S_2)}(tr_{var(S_1)}(\rho)) \\ &= tr_{var(S)}(\rho). \end{aligned}$$

Case 5. $S = \textbf{measure}\ M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}$. By the induction hypothesis on S_m for all

outcome m of measurement M, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
tr_{var(S)}([|S|](\rho)) &= \sum_m tr_{var(S)}([|S_m|](M_m\rho M_m^\dagger)) \\
&= \sum_m tr_{var(S)-var(S_m)}(tr_{var(S_m)}([|S_m|](M_m\rho M_m^\dagger))) \\
&= \sum_m tr_{var(S)-var(S_m)}(tr_{var(S_m)}(M_m\rho M_m^\dagger)) \\
&= \sum_m tr_{var(S)}(M_m\rho M_m^\dagger) \\
&= \sum_m tr_{var(S)-\{\overline{q}\}}(tr_{\overline{q}}(M_m\rho M_m^\dagger)) \\
&= \sum_m tr_{var(S)-\{\overline{q}\}}(tr_{\overline{q}}(M_m^\dagger M_m\rho)) \\
&= tr_{var(S)-\{\overline{q}\}}(tr_{\overline{q}}((\sum_m M_m^\dagger M_m)\rho)) \\
&= tr_{var(S)-\{\overline{q}\}}(tr_{\overline{q}}(\rho)) \\
&= tr_{var(S)}(\rho)
\end{aligned}$$

because $\sum_m M_m^\dagger M_m = I_{\mathcal{H}_{\overline{q}}}$.

Case 6. $S = \textbf{while}\ M[\overline{q}] = 1\ \textbf{do}\ S'$. For simplicity, we write **while** for quantum loop "$\textbf{while}\ M[\overline{q}] = 1\ \textbf{do}\ S'$". First, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
tr_{var(S)}([|(\textbf{while})^0|](\rho)) &= 0_{\mathcal{H}_{all}}, \\
tr_{var(S)}([|(\textbf{while})^n|](\rho)) &= tr_{var(S)}(\rho)
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

for all $n \geq 1$. This can be proved by induction on n. In fact,

$$(\textbf{while})^{k+1} = \textbf{measure}\ M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}$$

where $\overline{S} = S_0, S_1$, $S_0 = \textbf{skip}$, and $S_1 = S'; (\textbf{while})^k$. Thus, by Cases 1, 4 and 5, we can derive Eq. (17) for $n = k+1$ immediately from the induction hypothesis for $n = k$. Now, it follows from continuity of trace that

$$\begin{aligned}
tr_{var(S)}([|S|](\rho)) &= tr_{var(S)}(\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty}[|(\textbf{while})^n|](\rho)) \\
&= \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} tr_{var(S)}([|(\textbf{while})^n|](\rho)) \\
&= tr_{var(S)}(\rho).
\end{aligned}$$

(2) The trick is to prove the following slightly stronger conclusion:

- Claim: For any $var(S) \subseteq X \subseteq Var$, $tr_{X-var(S)}(\rho_1) = tr_{X-var(S)}(\rho_2)$ implies $tr_{X-var(S)}([|S|](\rho_1)) = tr_{X-var(S)}([|S|](\rho_2))$.

We also proceed by induction on the structure of S.

Case 1. $S = \mathbf{skip}$. Obvious.

Case 2. $S = q := 0$. We only consider the case of $type(q) = \mathbf{integer}$, the case of $type(q) = \mathbf{Boolean}$ is similar. First, let $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}_{X-\{q\}}$, then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
tr_{X-var(S)}([|S|](\rho)) &= tr_{X-\{q\}}[\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}(|0\rangle_q\langle n| \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{q\}}})\rho(|n\rangle_q\langle 0| \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{q\}}})] \\
&= \sum_i \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}(I_{\mathcal{H}_{(Var-X)\cup\{q\}}} \otimes \langle\psi_i|)(|0\rangle_q\langle n| \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{q\}}})\rho \\
&\qquad (|n\rangle_q\langle 0| \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{q\}}})(I_{\mathcal{H}_{(Var-X)\cup\{q\}}} \otimes |\psi_i\rangle) \\
&= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}((|0\rangle_q\langle n| \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{q\}}})\sum_i(I_{\mathcal{H}_{(Var-X)\cup\{q\}}} \otimes \langle\psi_i|)\rho \\
&\qquad (I_{\mathcal{H}_{(Var-X)\cup\{q\}}} \otimes |\psi_i\rangle)(|n\rangle_q\langle 0| \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{q\}}}) \\
&= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty}|0\rangle_q\langle n|tr_{X-var(S)}(\rho)|n\rangle_q\langle 0|.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, it is easy to see that (2) holds in this case.

Case 3. $S = \overline{q} := U\overline{q}$. Assume that $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}_{X-\{\overline{q}\}}$. Then it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
&tr_{X-var(S)}([|S|](\rho)) = tr_{X-\{\overline{q}\}}(U \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{\overline{q}\}}})\rho(U^\dagger \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{\overline{q}\}}}) \\
&= \sum_i(I_{\mathcal{H}_{(Var-X)\cup\{\overline{q}\}}} \otimes \langle\psi_i|)(U \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{\overline{q}\}}})\rho(U^\dagger \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{\overline{q}\}}})(I_{\mathcal{H}_{(Var-X)\cup\{\overline{q}\}}} \otimes |\psi_i\rangle) \\
&= (U \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{\overline{q}\}}})\sum_i(I_{\mathcal{H}_{(Var-X)\cup\{\overline{q}\}}} \otimes \langle\psi_i|)\rho(I_{\mathcal{H}_{(Var-X)\cup\{\overline{q}\}}} \otimes |\psi_i\rangle)(U^\dagger \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{\overline{q}\}}}) \\
&= (U \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{\overline{q}\}}})tr_{X-var(S)}(\rho)(U^\dagger \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{\overline{q}\}}})
\end{aligned}$$

because $|\psi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{X-\{\overline{q}\}}$, $U \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\overline{q}})$, and $(X - \{\overline{q}\}) \cap \{\overline{q}\} = \emptyset$. Now it is easy to see that (2) holds in this case.

Case 4. $S = S_1; S_2$. If $var(S_1) \cup var(S_2) = var(S) \subseteq X$, then there are $Y, Z \subseteq Var$ such that $var(S_1) \subseteq Y$, $var(S_2) \subseteq Z$ and

$$Y - var(S_1) = X - var(S) = Z - var(S_2).$$

Thus, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
tr_{Y-var(S_1)}(\rho_1) &= tr_{X-var(S)}(\rho_1) \\
&= tr_{X-var(S)}(\rho_2) \\
&= tr_{Y-var(S_1)}(\rho_2).
\end{aligned}$$

By the induction hypothesis on S_1, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} tr_{Z-var(S_2)}([|S_1|](\rho_1)) &= tr_{Y-var(S_1)}([|S_1|](\rho_1)) \\ &= tr_{Y-var(S_1)}([|S_1|](\rho_2)) \\ &= tr_{Z-var(S_2)}([|S_1|](\rho_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, by the induction hypothesis on S_2, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} tr_{X-var(S)}([|S|](\rho_1)) &= tr_{Z-var(S_2)}([|S_2|]([|S_1|](\rho_1))) \\ &= tr_{Z-var(S_2)}([|S_2|]([|S_1|](\rho_2))) \\ &= tr_{(X-var(S)}([|S|](\rho_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Case 5. $S =$ **measure** $M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}$. First, let $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}_{X-var(S)}$. Then for any outcome m of measurement M, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} tr_{X-var(S)}(M_m \rho M_m^\dagger) &= \sum_i (I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-(X-var(S))}} \otimes \langle\psi_i|)(M_m \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{\overline{q}\}}})\rho \\ &\qquad (M_m^\dagger \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{\overline{q}\}}})(I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-(X-var(S))}} \otimes |\psi_i\rangle) \\ &= (M_m \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{\overline{q}\}}}) \sum_i (I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-(X-var(S))}} \otimes \langle\psi_i|)\rho \\ &\qquad (I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-(X-var(S))}} \otimes |\psi_i\rangle)(M_m^\dagger \otimes I_{\mathcal{H}_{Var-\{\overline{q}\}}}) \\ &= M_m tr_{X-var(S)}(\rho) M_m^\dagger \end{aligned}$$

because $|\psi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{X-var(S)}$, $M_m \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{\overline{q}})$ and $(X - var(S)) \cap \{\overline{q}\} = \emptyset$. Consequently, it follows from $tr_{X-var(S)}(\rho_1) = tr_{X-var(S)}(\rho_2)$ that

$$tr_{X-var(S)}(M_m \rho_1 M_m^\dagger) = tr_{X-var(S)}(M_m \rho_2 M_m^\dagger).$$

Note that we can write $X - var(S) = Y - var(S_m)$ for some $Y \supseteq var(S_m)$. Then it holds that

$$tr_{Y-var(S_m)}(M_m \rho_1 M_m^\dagger) = tr_{Y-var(S_m)}(M_m \rho_2 M_m^\dagger).$$

By the induction hypothesis on S_m, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} tr_{X-var(S)}([|S_m|](M_m \rho_1 M_m^\dagger)) &= tr_{Y-var(S_m)}([|S_m|](M_m \rho_1 M_m^\dagger)) \\ &= tr_{Y-var(S_m)}([|S_m|](M_m \rho_2 M_m^\dagger)) \\ &= tr_{X-var(S)}([|S_m|](M_m \rho_2 M_m^\dagger)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} tr_{X-var(S)}([|S|](\rho_1)) &= tr_{X-var(S)} \sum_m [|S_m|](M_m \rho_1 M_m^\dagger) \\ &= \sum_m tr_{X-var(S)}([|S_m|](M_m \rho_1 M_m^\dagger)) \\ &= \sum_m tr_{X-var(S)}([|S_m|](M_m \rho_2 M_m^\dagger)) \\ &= tr_{X-var(S)} \sum_m [|S_m|](M_m \rho_2 M_m^\dagger) \\ &= tr_{X-var(S)}([|S|](\rho_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Case 6. $S = \textbf{while}\ M[\overline{q}] = 1\ \textbf{do}\ S'$. Assume that $tr_{X-var(S)}(\rho_1) = tr_{X-var(S)}(\rho_2)$. Using Cases 1, 4 and 5, we can show that

$$tr_{X-var(S)}([|(\textbf{while})^n|](\rho_1)) = tr_{X-var(S)}([|(\textbf{while})^n|](\rho_2))$$

for all $n \geq 0$ by induction on n. Therefore, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} tr_{X-var(S)}([|\textbf{while}|](\rho_1)) &= tr_{X-var(S)}(\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} [|(\textbf{while})^n|](\rho_1)) \\ &= \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} tr_{X-var(S)}([|(\textbf{while})^n|](\rho_1)) \\ &= \bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} tr_{X-var(S)}([|(\textbf{while})^n|](\rho_2)) \\ &= tr_{X-var(S)}(\bigvee_{n=0}^{\infty} [|(\textbf{while})^n|](\rho_2)) \\ &= tr_{X-var(S)}([|\textbf{while}|](\rho_2)) \end{aligned}$$

by continuity of trace.

(*Skip*) $$\frac{}{\langle \mathbf{skip}, \rho\rangle \rightarrow \langle E, \rho\rangle}$$

(*Initialization*) $$\frac{}{\langle q := 0, \rho\rangle \rightarrow \langle E, \rho_0^q\rangle}$$

where

$$\rho_0^q = |0\rangle_q\langle 0|\rho|0\rangle_q\langle 0| + |0\rangle_q\langle 1|\rho|1\rangle_q\langle 0|$$

if $type(q) = \mathbf{Boolean}$, and

$$\rho_0^q = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |0\rangle_q\langle n|\rho|n\rangle_q\langle 0|$$

if $type(q) = \mathbf{integer}$.

(*Unitary Transformation*) $$\frac{}{\langle \overline{q} := U\overline{q}, \rho\rangle \rightarrow \langle E, U\rho U^\dagger\rangle}$$

(*Sequential Composition*) $$\frac{\langle S_1, \rho\rangle \rightarrow \langle S_1', \rho'\rangle}{\langle S_1; S_2, \rho\rangle \rightarrow \langle S_1'; S_2, \rho\rangle}$$

where we make the convention that $E; S_2 = S_2$.

(*Measurement*) $$\frac{}{\langle \mathbf{measure}\ M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}, \rho\rangle \rightarrow \langle S_m, M_m\rho M_m^\dagger\rangle}$$

for each outcome m of measurement $M = \{M_m\}$

(*Loop* 0) $$\frac{}{\langle \mathbf{while}\ M[\overline{q}] = 1\ \mathbf{do}\ S, \rho\rangle \rightarrow \langle E, M_0\rho M_0^\dagger\rangle}$$

(*Loop* 1) $$\frac{}{\langle \mathbf{while}\ M[\overline{q}] = 1\ \mathbf{do}\ S, \rho\rangle \rightarrow \langle S; \mathbf{while}\ M[\overline{q}] = 1\ \mathbf{do}\ S, M_1\rho M_1^\dagger\rangle}$$

Figure 1: Transitional Semantics of Quantum Programs

(*Axiom Skip*) $\{P\}\mathbf{Skip}\{P\}$

(*Axiom Initialization*) If $type(q) = \mathbf{Boolean}$, then

$$\{|0\rangle_q\langle 0|P|0\rangle_q\langle 0| + |1\rangle_q\langle 0|P|0\rangle_q\langle 1|\}q := 0\{P\}$$

and if $type(q) = \mathbf{integer}$, then

$$\{\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} |n\rangle_q\langle 0|P|0\rangle_q\langle n|\}q := 0\{P\}$$

(*Axiom Unitary Transformation*) $\{U^\dagger PU\}\overline{q} := U\overline{q}\{P\}$

(*Rule Sequential Composition*) $$\frac{\{P\}S_1\{Q\} \qquad \{Q\}S_2\{R\}}{\{P\}S_1; S_2\{R\}}$$

(*Rule Measurement*) $$\frac{\{P_m\}S_m\{Q\} \text{ for all } m}{\{\sum_m M_m^\dagger P_m M_m\}\mathbf{measure}\ M[\overline{q}] : \overline{S}\{Q\}}$$

(*Rule Loop Partial*) $$\frac{\{Q\}S\{M_0^\dagger PM_0 + M_1^\dagger QM_1\}}{\{M_0^\dagger PM_0 + M_1^\dagger QM_1\}\mathbf{while}\ M[\overline{q}] = 1\ \mathbf{do}\ S\{P\}}$$

(*Rule Order*) $$\frac{P \sqsubseteq P' \quad \{P'\}S\{Q'\} \quad Q' \sqsubseteq Q}{\{P\}S\{Q\}}$$

Figure 2: Proof System qPD of Partial Correctness

(*Rule Loop Total*) $$\frac{\begin{array}{c}\{Q\}S\{M_0^\dagger PM_0 + M_1^\dagger QM_1\} \\ \text{for any } \epsilon > 0,\ t_\epsilon \text{ is a } (M_1^\dagger QM_1, \epsilon) - \text{bound function} \\ \text{of loop } \mathbf{while}\ M[\overline{q}] = 1\ \mathbf{do}\ S\end{array}}{\{M_0^\dagger PM_0 + M_1^\dagger QM_1\}\mathbf{while}\ M[\overline{q}] = 1\ \mathbf{do}\ S\{P\}}$$

Figure 3: Proof System qTD of Total Correctness